DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 934 CS 501 030

TITLE	To Create the American Film Institute as an Independent Agency; Hearings before the Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 93rd Congress, Second Session, on H.R. 17021, A Bill to Amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 to Create the American Film Institute as an Independent Agency, Held in Washington, D.C. Oct. 7 and 8, 1974.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	186p.; See related document CS501031
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$9.51 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Agencies; *Educational Legislation; *Federal Legislation; *Films
IDENTIFIERS	*American Film Institute; House Subcommittee Hearings

ABSTRACT

This report is on the hearings before the House Select Subcommittee on Education, conducted on October 7 and 8, 1974, to consider the creation of the American Film Institute as an independent agency. Witnesses testifying before the subcommittee included: Maya Angelou, Ellen Burstyn, John Culkin, Ed Emshwiller, John Hancock, Nancy Hanks, Charlton Heston, Ed Lynch, Gerald O'Grady, Ted Perry, David Mallery, Russel Nye, John Schneider, George Stevens Jr., and Roger Stevens. Prepared statements, letters, and supplemental material were presented by James Cagney, John Culkin, David Mallery, Russell Nye, Gerald O'Grady, Ted Perry, Rosalind Russell, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., George Stevens Jr., Dennis Weaver, Roy White, and Robert Wise. (WR)

TO CREATE THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED103934

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 17021

A BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965 TO CREATE THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 7 AND 8, 1974

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: CS IR
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
43-831 WASHINGTON : 1974

CS 501 030

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky
HERMAN BADILLO, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
JAIME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
JACK F. KEMP, New York
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
DAVID TOWELL, Nevada
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
ROBERT J. HUBER, Michigan

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana, *Chairman*

PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky
HERMAN BADILLO, New York
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida

EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut

CONTENTS

Hearings held in Washington, D.C.:
October 7, 1974 1
October 8, 1974 67
Text of H.R. 17021 1
Statement of—
Angelou, Maya, writer, poet, and filmmaker; Ellen Burstyn, actress; AFI Women's Workshop, a panel consisting of 81
Culkin, John, executive director, Center for Understanding Media 62
Emshwiller, Ed, independent film maker 87
Hancock, John, AFI independent filmmaker; Terrence Malick, former AFI fellow; and Ed Emshwiller, independent filmmaker 86
Hanks, Nancy, Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, accompanied by Mr. Michael Straight, Deputy Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts 30
Heston, Charlton, chairman, the American Film Institute Board of Trustees 5
Lynch, Ed, president, Association of Independent Video and Filmmakers, Inc., New York 67
O'Grady, Gerald, director of media studies, State University of New York; Ted Perry, professor and chairman, Department of Cinema Study, New York University; David Mallery, director of studies, National Association of Independent Schools, Philadelphia, Pa.; and Russel B. Nye, professor of English, Michigan State University, a panel consisting of 96
Schneider, John A., president, CBS Broadcast Group, actor-producer 18
Stevens, George, Jr., director, the American Film Institute 44
Stevens, George, director, American Film Institute, accompanied by Richard Brandt, chairman, executive committee, American Film Institute 72
Stevens, Roger, Director, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts 92
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.:
Gagney, James, Stanfordville, N.Y., telegram to Chairman Brademas 5
Culkin, Dr. John, executive director, Center for Understanding Media, New York, N.Y., prepared statement of 63
Hanks, Nancy, Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, Chairman, National Council on the Arts:
Conservatories funded by the National Endowment for the Arts, fiscal year 1974 (table) 42
Contracts awarded by public media program (table) 37
Prepared statement of 26
Mallery, David, director of studies National Association of Independent Schools, Philadelphia, Pa., statement of 163
Nye, Russell B., professor of English, Michigan State University, statement of 164
O'Grady, Dr. Gerald, director of the center for media studies, State University of New York:
"Daniel Resignation Accepted by AFI; Won Battle, Lost War in Tangle Over Bureaucracy," an article entitled 154
Letter to George Stevens from Samuel Grossman et al., dated July 29, 1974 152
Letter to George Stevens from Thomas Rickman et al., dated July 29, 1974 153
Letter to the members of the board of trustees from Lonon Smith et al., dated August 2, 1974 153
Prepared testimony of 98

Page

Report on the Conference on Regional Development of Film Centers and Services 176
"The American Film Institute," an article entitled 117
"The Preparation of Teachers of Media," an article entitled 105
"The Unfocused One," an article entitled 140
Perry, Ted, professor and chairman, department of cinema at ... New York University, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated Oct ... ber 17, 1974 3
Rosalind, Beverly Hills, Calif., telegram to Chairman Brademas 3
Schlesinger, Dr. Arthur, Jr., American Historian, prepared statement of 17
Stevens, George, Jr., director, American Film Institute:
Letter to Chairman Brademas, enclosing information requested 78
Prepared statement of 48
Webster, Dennis, president, Screen Actors Guild, prepared statement of 16
White, Roy R., chairman, National Association of Theater Owners, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 4, 1974 16
Wise, Robert, president, Screen Directors Guild, prepared statement of 15

APPENDIX

Page

American Film Institute, memorandum 169
Belle, Anne, Independent Filmmaker, Brunswick, New York, telegram to Chairman Brademas 183
Browne, Ray, Bowling Green Ohio, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 9, 1974 186
Calhoun, Clair, president, Association for Media Education, Concord, Calif., mailgram to Chairman Brademas 178
Collenbach, Ernest, editor, Film Quarterly, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 8, 1974 180
Coleman, Mary Jane, director, Sinking Creek Film Celebration, Greeneville, Tenn., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 11, 1974 181
Cooper, Karen, Film Forum, New York, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 178
Dunn, Jon R., director, Pennsylvania Department of Education, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 177
Eastin, Kent, president, Eastin-Phelan Corp., Blackhawk Films, Davenport, Iowa, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 187
Egan, Catherine M., audio visual specialist, State College Pennsylvania, telegram to Select Education Subcommittee 182
Essert, Gary, director, Los Angeles International Film Exposition, Los Angeles, Calif., telegram to Chairman Brademas 184
Geoghegan, John, president, Detroit Area Film Teachers, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 186
Gladfelter, Ray, director, National ITV Development WETA–TV, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 16, 1974 180
Haag, John, associate professor, The Pennsylvania State University, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 10, 1974 181
Hetzer, William, New York State Education Department, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 178
Hoodle, Will, associate professor, art department, University of South Florida, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 10, 1974 182
Jackson, Lawrence, University Cinema Associates, Inc., mailgram to Chairman Brademas 185
Johnson, Stephen C., Indiana University, Audio Visual Center, Bloomington Ind., telegram to Select Education Subcommittee 186
Kantor, Bernard R., chairman, division of cinema, University of Southern California, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 14, 1974 182
Kaplan, Richard, film consultant, City University of New York, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated November 25, 1974 189
Kemper, Terry, Whitney Museum, New York, telegram to Chairman Brademas 179
Kinder, Marsha, professor, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif., mailgram to Chairman Brademas 186
Lamm, L., Austin, New York, N.Y., mailgram to Chairman Brademas 186
Lawder, Standish D., associate professor, history of art, Yale University, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 15, 1974 185
Layboirne, Kit, New York, N.Y., telegram to Select Education Subcommittee 180
Loar, Peggy, curator of education, Indianapolis Museum of Art, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 177
Lyons, Timothy J., assistant professor, School of Communications and Theater, Temple University, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 9, 1974 188
Mackendrick, Alexander, dean, school of film, California Institute of the Arts, telegram to Chairman Brademas 177

Page

Marchetti, Frank, professor of communication, The University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 17, 1974 176
Marsden, Michael T., co-editor, The Journal of Popular Film, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 9, 1974 185
Morgan, Bernard, Bicentennial Office, Smithsonian Institution, telegram to Chairman Brademas 178
National Endowment for the Arts, memorandum 171
Norman, Martha W., director, special arts project, Louisville, Ky., mailgram to Chairman Brademas 184
Parmentier, Ernest, editor, Film Facts, telegram to Select Subcommittee on Education 188
Platt, Richard, executive secretary, National Association of Media Educators, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 187
Reisner, Carl, grantee of the AFI - Independent Film Program, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 180
Rosenberg, Victor, assistant professor, School of Librarianship, University of California, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 177
Schneider, Dr. Irving, Chevy Chase, Md., telegram to Chairman Brademas 183
Stine, Dr. Robert M., director, North West Film Study Center, Portland Art Museum, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 187
Strongin, James W., president, JS Communications, Inc., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 10, 1974 187
Sufer, Howard, Ph. D., Canoga Park, Calif., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 10, 1974 179
Sutton, Ronald L., assistant professor, Department of Communication, American University, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 178
Teton, John, lecturer, department of film, San Francisco State University, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 183
Turner, Evan, Philadelphia Museum of Art, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 181
Wagner, Robert W., professor and director of graduate studies, the Ohio State University, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 176
Weaver, Dennis, president, Screen Actors Guild, telegram to Chairman Brademas 175
Weisberg, Ruth, acting associate dean, School of Architecture and Fine Arts, University of Southern California, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 178
Wright, Prescott, chairman, advisory board association for immediate educators, mailgram to Chairman Brademas 185
Wright, Prescott J., president, Film Wright, San Francisco, Calif., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated October 18, 1974 183

TO CREATE THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The select subcommittee met at 9:45 a.m., pursuant to notice, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Brademas (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Brademas, Lehman, Quie, Hansen, and Sarasin.

Staff members present: Jack G. Duncan, counsel, and Yvonne Franklin, minority legislative assistant.

[Text of H.R. 17021 follows:]

[H.R. 17021, 93d Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 to create the American Film Institute as an independent agency

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that motion pictures and television have made valuable and enduring contributions to American culture;

(2) that from the beginning of this century, Americans have played preeminent roles in extending and enriching the art of film;

(3) that older films constitute an important historical resource for students of American life and art, and should be preserved from loss and decay;

(4) that skills in film making should be advanced, and understanding of the art of film should be enhanced, through the training and encouragement of artists, teachers, and scholars, and through the publication of records of film history;

(5) that it is appropriate for the Federal Government to assist such efforts, in the interest of increasing public appreciation of outstanding films, and of assuring the continuing vitality of the art of film in America;

(6) that the American Film Institute, a nonprofit corporation, was founded in 1967 as a national institution intended to advance, preserve, exhibit, and teach the art of film; and that its purposes can best be achieved through the direct support of the Federal Government, as well as of private donors.

SEC. 2. The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE II—AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

"SEC. 102. (a) There is authorized to be established a new nonprofit corporation, to be known as the American Film Institute (hereinafter the 'Institute') which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Institute so established shall be subject to the provisions of this section, and, to the extent consistent with this section, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"(b) The Institute shall have a Board of Trustees (hereinafter referred to as the Board) whose duties it shall be to maintain and administer the Institute and to execute such other functions as are vested in the Board by sections 102 to 108 of this Act.

"(c) The Board shall be composed of twenty-three members as follows:

"(1) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

"(2) the Librarian of Congress;

"(3) the Archivist of the United States;

"(4) the chairman of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts;

"(5) the Secretary of the Interior;

"(6) the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts;

"(7) the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities;

"(8) two members of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and two members of the House appointed by the Speaker of the House: *Provided*, That not more than two of the Members of House and Senate so appointed shall be of the same political party; and

"(9) twelve appointed by the Board of Trustees of the American Film Institute, confirmed by a majority vote of the House of Representatives and the Senate, serving on the date of enactment of this Act; each member of the Board of Trustees appointed under this subsection shall serve for the following terms, as designated at the time of their appointment: three for terms of two years, three for terms of four years, and four for terms of six years; their successors shall be appointed by the remaining trustees appointed under this subsection, and shall serve for terms of six years. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions, a member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

"(d) The members of the Board first appointed under paragraph (7) of subsection (c) above shall serve as incorporators of the Institute as authorized by this Act, and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the Institute under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"(e) The Board shall annually elect a Chairman from among its members.

"POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD

"SEC. 103. (a) In administering the Institute, the Board shall have all necessary and proper powers, which shall include but not be limited to the power to—

"(1) provide for the publication of historical records and of commentaries on the art of film, and disseminate such materials;

"(2) undertake and coordinate, through contract or otherwise, the preservation of films and film artifacts of artistic and historical value (including films and recordings made for television), and the production of films for charitable, patriotic, educational, or other public purposes;

"(3) maintain and operate a conservatory for advanced studies in the cinematic arts, cause materials developed at such conservatory to be made available for study in other institutions, and make grants to persons who demonstrate particular promise as film makers;

"(4) provide programing assistance to exhibitors throughout the Nation in order to increase the accessibility of such films to the American public;

"(5) provide for the appropriate recognition of extraordinary contributions to the art of film;

"(6) advise and assist educational institutions and other organizations as to methods of teaching and research, including workshops, conferences, seminars, and publications, relating to the art of motion pictures and television;

"(7) solicit, accept, and dispose of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, securities, and other properties of whatsoever character for the benefit of the Institute, including contributions derived from National Film Day theater ticket sales and American Film Institute Lifetime Achievement Award celebrations;

"(8) obtain grants from, and make contracts with, State, Federal, local, and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals;

"(9) acquire, hold, maintain, use, operate, and dispose of any physical facilities, including equipment, necessary for the administration and operation of the Institute; and

"(10) appoint and fix the compensation of a director and such other officers and employees of the Institute as may be necessary for its efficient operation. The director and such other officers and employees shall be well qualified by experience and training in films or television to perform the duties of their office.

"NONPROFIT NATURE OF THE INSTITUTE

"SEC. 104. The Institute shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends, and no part of the income or assets of the Institute shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, or employee of the Institute except as salary or reasonable compensation for services and travel expenses.

"ADMINISTRATION AND QUORUM

SEC. 105. The Board is authorized to adopt an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and to make such by laws, rules, and regulations as it deems necessary for the administration of its functions under this Act.

"REPORT TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 106. The Institute shall submit an annual report to the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, for his transmittal to Congress on or before December 30 of each year. The report shall include a comprehensive report of the Institute's operations, financial condition, and accomplishments under this section.

"FINANCING

"SEC. 107. The Federal Government shall contribute two-thirds of the budget to operate Institute programs, and the Institute will raise one-third of the budget from private sources.

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Institute such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS

"SEC. 108. The financial transactions of the Institute involving the receipt or expenditure of Federal funds during any fiscal year may be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress, and a copy of each report shall be furnished to the President. The report shall contain such comments as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform Congress of the expenditure of such Federal funds, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he may deem advisable.

"SEC. 109. This title may be cited as the 'American Film Institute Act'.".

Mr. BRADEMAS. The Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor will come to order for the purpose of hearings on H.R. 17021, a bill to create the American Film Institute as an independent agency.

The Chair is pleased to note that, this bill has been introduced with strong bipartisan backing. Joining me in sponsoring the measure are the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman Carl D. Perkins, and the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman Albert H. Quie, the chairman and ranking minority Member, respectively, of the Committee on Education and Labor; along with the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Thompson; the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. Hansen; the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Mrs. Mink; the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Meeds; the gentleman from New York, Mr. Peyser; the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. Hansen; the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Sarasin and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Cederberg.

Our distinguished colleague in the Senate, the Honorable Claiborne Pell, is sponsoring companion legislation in the other body.

By way of background, I should point out that the American Film Institute was created in 1967 by the National Endowment for the Arts, following a commitment made by President Lyndon B. Johnson when he signed the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965.

President Johnson said at the signing ceremony:

"We will create an American Film Institute, bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators and young men and women who wish to pursue this 20th century art form as their life's work."

With the assistance of the National Endowment for the Arts, the Institute has been capably pursuing the goals enunciated by President Johnson.

Among the Institute's accomplishments to date have been:

The preservation in the Library of Congress of over 9,500 American films, including the original negatives of "Birth of a Nation," which might otherwise have been lost;

The completion of two volumes of a 19-volume catalog of American films;

The opening, in the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, of the American Film Institute Theatre; and

The establishment of the AFI Center for Advanced Film Studies in Los Angeles.

But because of the importance of the Institute's work, as well as of the unique American contribution to the film art, some of us in Congress believe that the time has come to consider establishing the Institute on a statutory base of its own.

We are, therefore, holding these hearings in order to examine closely the Institute's accomplishments and future plans.

Briefly, H.R. 17021 would create an independent American Film Institute under the direction of a 23-member board of trustees made up of Federal officials and private citizens.

The bill authorizes to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act, but specifies that Federal funds may be utilized to cover no more than two-thirds of the costs of the Institute's activities, and that the Institute must raise the remaining one-third from private sources.

On our witness list this morning is a distinguished cross-section of individuals concerned with the film art.

We shall hear first from Academy Award winner Charlton Heston, chairman of the American Film Institute's board of trustees.

We shall hear as well from John A. Schneider, president of the CBS Broadcast group; Ms. Nancy Hanks, chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts; and George Stevens, Jr., director of the Institute.

Following this testimony, we shall hear from a panel composed of John Culkin, director of the Center for Understanding Media in New York; Willard Van Dyke, chairman of the Film Department, New York State University at Purchase, New York; and Ed Lynch, president, Association of Independent Video and Filmmakers, Inc., of New York.

The Chair would also ask unanimous consent at this time to place in the record the text of two telegrams endorsing this legislation from Mr. James Cagney and Miss Rosalind Russell, member National Council on the Arts.

[The documents referred to follow:]

[Telegram]

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
[illegible] Subcommittee on Education,
Washington, D.C.

I would like to express the Members of Congress who have introduced the legislation to provide for a permanent existence of the American Film Institute. As one who has spent [illegible] active years in film, I urge the passage of this bill knowing intimately the cultural value of an institution such as the AFI. I have observed the work of the American Film Institute both in Hollywood and also in Washington through its present appointment on the National Council on the Arts. Our country, more than any other in the world, is known for its capacity to both entertain and educate through the film medium and the most qualified institution to maintain these principles is the American Film Institute. I urge that this legislation be passed for the growth of each individual and of our Nation.

ROSALIND RUSSELL.

[Telegram]

STANFORD, N.Y.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Special Subcommittee on Education,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: My association with the American Film Institute was a most satisfactory one and their aims in promoting films as an art form seemed to me most worthy. That the films of the past and the present be preserved for future viewers is also a happy aim and your help in nurturing so meaningful an effort would be truly appreciated by serious students of film everywhere. All good wishes.

Sincerely,

JAMES CAGNEY.

We are very pleased to welcome to the hearing Mr. Charlton Heston, who in addition to being a distinguished actor, has, as chairman of the American Film Institute board of trustees, devoted an enormous amount of his time and energy to the work of the institute and this particularly American art form, film.

Mr. Heston, we are very pleased to have you with us, and you may proceed, sir.

STATEMENT OF CHARLTON HESTON, CHAIRMAN, THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mr. HESTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, for the record, my name is Charlton Heston. I've been a professional actor all my adult life, and I have done time on the boards of most of the organizations serving the performing arts: The National Council on the Arts, the Centre Theatre Group, the Screen Actors Guild, and the American Film Institute, of which I am currently chairman, and on whose behalf I appear today.

The 14 years during which I have been doing chores for these bodies have seen a remarkable change in the American attitude toward the arts—though I'm not necessarily suggesting the two circumstances are related. It is no longer necessary to persuade anyone in or out of government that the arts are important to this country, that indeed they are central to what has come to be called the quality of life.

I certainly don't need to argue that case with you. You in the Congress have demonstrated your conviction by voting larger sums each year to support the arts with public moneys. I think you are right to do this, even as our national priorities tighten, because the public funds you spend in this way go not just to the arts, or to the men and

women who serve them, but through them to all Americans, in aid of what Thomas Jefferson called the pursuit of happiness.

Federal funding for the arts, of course, has been largely channeled through the agency created for that purpose in 1965, the National Council on the Arts. I served a term as trustee on the council and have watched with enormous pride and pleasure the way it has grown from its modest beginnings and even more modest budget, when the first chairman, Roger Stevens, carefully stretched some $4 million to cover all the arts programs in the country.

Today, under the able guidance of Nancy Hanks, a budget 10 times that sum is allocated to a richly varied program of cultural grants covering every aspect of every art in the land, from poetry to pot-making and from symphonies to street dancing.

One of the first projects funded by the council on the arts, as your Chairman mentioned, and indeed the only project mandated by President Johnson, when he signed the bill creating the council, was the American Film Institute. "There will be an American film institute," he said. And there is. As a filmmaker, I might add, "high time, too."

Though we are clearly doing our best in this country to catch up, it is nevertheless true that our country has lagged sadly behind other nations in its support for the arts. Not long ago, Clive Barnes of the New York Times testified before Congress that the city of Hamburg gave more money to its opera and ballet company than this country gave to all the performing arts in our Nation.

As an actor, this concerns me. As chairman of the American Film Institute, I am convinced it indicates a priority that must be re-examined. If it is appropriate to respond to the growing need on the part of our countrymen to have arts function in their lives, it is also necessary to recognize that, of all the arts, the one most significantly of our time and of our Nation is film.

This is not to denigrate the other arts. Architecture and painting have shaped the world's culture for 2,000 years, the novel and opera for several hundred.

A national culture cannot exist without them, or their sister arts as well. Of all the arts, the youngest is film. It was born in this country, and in this century, it has come to dominate it culturally.

More than any other art, it can leap national boundaries, break through language barriers. Indeed, it has done so. People everywhere see more films in a year than they read books or listen to music or look at paintings in a decade, perhaps in a lifetime. I am not saying this is good or bad. I am simply saying that it is true. Film is the art form of the twentieth century.

If it is the art of our time, I think it is also the art of our country. American artists have contributed more significantly to world cinema than they have to any other art form. We share with England the language that remains essentially the lingua franca of film. The pre-eminent artists of American film significantly shape the work of the great filmmakers of all nations, while American financing and film technology of course remain dominant. In a very real sense, American films speak for our Nation more clearly, communicate more tellingly than any ambassador we can send to the rest of the world.

Our films function for us across the world not only as ambassadors, but as consistent black ink entries in our balance of trade. This may

seem a crass reference to make in the midst of a statement so relentlessly cultural in tone, but the condition of our economy today demands that I point out that American films are successfully exported all over the world. The only natural resource they deplete is the talent of our filmmakers. This resource, we are constantly replenishing. It is infinitely replenishable.

This is precisely the responsibility of the AFI: To replenish and protect this rich, vital cultural resource that has given so much to this country and to the world. Our charter says we are "to preserve what is great in the past of the American film and support what can be great in its future." Other witnesses at these hearings will testify as to how we try to do this and how much better we could do it if our desperately meager resources were augmented.

You will also hear comments about why it is no longer feasible for the AFI to carry out its mandate under the umbrella of the Council on the Arts. I would like to speak to a further point: Why it is necessary for us now to go our own way, under the terms of the bill you are now considering. It was the chairman of the national council who first suggested that we seek a separate identity, and of course, she was right.

I have made films all over the world, and in every one of the many countries I have visited with national film institutes, each institute was a separate government supported agency, designed much as this bill would structure the AFI. Under its terms, the AFI would then have the autonomy a national organization requires as well as the importance film deserves as our prime cultural asset and a national resource of enormous value.

If you will allow me an ad-lib parenthesis here on an area that other witnesses will testify to on the specifics of some of our programs, we just opened for the academic year our Center for Advance Film Studies at Graystone in Hollywood, where some 52 fellows are studying filmmaking with access to the enormously rich pool of professional filmmakers that we are able to call on without charge. It is an enormously inspiring thing, if you care at all about film, to recognize how film, not only in its appeal to audiences, but in the kinds of people it draws as filmmakers, as apprentices, if you will, how those 52 fellows represent every color, age, social, and economic background in a way that I think it is difficult for the other arts to do.

It is clearly the art of our time, and to see them interreact as I have in, for example, recent seminars we had with the distinguished British Film Director David Lean, who was a little apprehensive about what he somehow envisioned as a confrontation with the classic cliché of the revolutionary student generation that we came to apprehend in the sixties, and he said to me:

> I suppose they will think me terribly old fashioned, won't they?

And I said:

> David, they won't. These fellows have been doing nothing for the past 2 weeks but looking at your films. They have seen all of them and know them cut for cut, and all they want to do is listen to you talk about them.

Of course, that was true, and to see the way this works in a unique way at that center is a very exciting thing, and you can clearly perceive that the future of film is, I think, sprouting seeds right there.

Of course, I am pleading a special case, from a position of deep commitment, both as a filmmaker and for the American Film Institute. I am a biased witness. I believe in film. It is indeed an idea whose time has come.

Others will speak to you from our blueprints; let me speak from the passion of that belief. We have really only begun to see what film can do to enrich the lives and expand the opportunities for the American people—all the American people. It will write the poetry of our time, and it will serve as a tool as well to build bridges for us to the rest of the world.

I think it is clear I believe in this bill. I hope the committee sees fit to endorse it and the Congress passes it into law. I thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Heston, for a most useful opening statement.

I have a number of questions to put to you that involve some of the criticisms that have been made of the work of the AFI, and perhaps you could give us your comments from your vantage point on the board.

One of them has to do with the financial difficulties that the Institute has experienced since its inception, and I wonder if you could comment on any new developments in this area that might give some promise for the future?

Mr. HESTON. Yes; I think that we have indeed had enormous financial difficulties. I would be distressed if we didn't have financial difficulties, because I would think we were not attempting to do as much as we should.

Given the fact we are a young organization, attempting somehow to cover a national responsibility, both archival and educational, and to establish direct lines of communication with film audiences, we could, of course, use 10 times the budget we have. We have had considerable difficulties raising the budget that we have allocated.

It would be impossible to do what we have done without the enormous and understanding cooperation of Nancy Hanks and her council. I think it is also important to underscore that, in my opinion and in the opinion, I think, of everybody involved at the AFI, it would be a mistake for us to depend entirely on the private sector, entirely on the professional filmmaking community, or entirely on the Government. Either total relationship, it seems to me, would compromise us in an unfortunate way.

We could, perhaps, seek out a more embracing relationship with the professional filmmaking community. As you all know, the studios have experienced considerable economic difficulties from which they are perhaps just beginning to emerge. The past 10 or 15 years have been a rather bleak picture, financially, for them. It is not easy to get funds from them.

Nevertheless, all of the studios have given us contributions, as have the networks, as have various organizations such as the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. We have had support from the foundations. But I would hesitate to accept total support from any single source. For example, if, in the unlikely eventuality that the Association of Motion Picture Producers came to us and said, "Look, let us undertake your whole budget and put some more of our people on your Board," I would be uneasy about that relationship, because our re-

sponsibility is not just to the professional film-making community or to the audience or to our archival responsibility with the Library of Congress, but to the totality of film in this country. And we are the only organization with that charge, and we can only do so by keeping a foot in every camp, as it were.

That means that we cannot and should not look to any one of those areas for support, total support.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me ask you about another area in which criticisms have arisen. You are aware that there has been some criticism of the management of the AFI and, of course, there was the recent controversy surrounding the firing of the Director of the Center for Advanced Film Studies at Greystone. I wonder if you could give us any comments, Mr. Heston, as Chairman of the Board, about the management of the Institute?

Mr. HESTON. I am not an expert in business administration, but as nearly as I have been able to discern, we have been steadily progressing in streamlining our executive and administrative table of organization.

We have, on the one hand, been making changes dictated by needs, dictated by efficiency and, on the other hand, by necessity to bear our budget.

As for the recent controversy over the resignation of the Dean of the Center, I think that is not entirely untypical of the kinds of controversies that occur in an educational institution. I had an interesting input on that from a close friend of mine, who is chairman of the department of neuropsychiatry at UCLA and an educator and educational administrator of national reputation, Dr. West.

He says:

You must understand, Chuck, in any controversy between a teacher and the institution that employs him, instinctively, the teacher is presented as a martyr and the administration as a group of devils.

He said:

This has nothing to do with the issues at stake, but the nature of the way schools are perceived by the students in them and the public at large.

I think, in fact, when you examine, for example, the current controversies of the schools in West Virginia, and another group of schools in Boston, you will agree that we carried out our little trouble with reasonable efficiency and dispatch.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Heston.

Mr. Hansen.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me welcome you back to this committee. We very much appreciated your testimony in the past when we considered the AFI as a part of the Endowment.

I am interested in your observations of this morning indicating that, in your judgment, the Institute will be better served in the long run by the separate identity, as you put it. Maybe you can eliminate some of my lingering doubts.

Mr. HESTON. I hope so.

Mr. HANSEN. I am a sponsor of this legislation and have joined it in the belief that it is your belief and those who are associated with the Institute that it can indeed accomplish its purpose more effectively and presumably generate more support with separate identity. I would

have thought somewhat just the opposite, very frankly: that its being a part of the Endowment, sharing in the funds that are also too limited, although they have been rising in the last few years——

Mr. Heston. Indeed, constantly increasing.

Mr. Hansen [continuing]. That it had somewhat of an assured future at least.

Now, stepping outside of the Endowment, it seems to me, involves the possibility that substantially more may be generated, but also, the risk that, maybe considerably less will be forthcoming and that, as so many of these authorizations, there are little or no funds when the appropriation process is completed.

So, maybe, here you can strengthen my faith that indeed this is the right step and it will help in a very material way to accomplish the laudable objectives that the Institute seeks to achieve, and I think it has done a remarkable job in serving in the past.

Mr. Heston. I will try to do that, Congressman.

In the first place, I think the separation of the Institute from its relationship with the Endowment is a necessary evolutionary, not revolutionary, step. To develop on that last comment for a moment, it, of course, would not be a unique governmental relationship. There are a number of other organizations indeed serving the Arts that are outside of the Endowment, such as the Smithsonian and Kennedy Center, to name two which come to mind.

In the second place, I think I can speak with reasonable objectivity and from a reasonable platform of personal experience in saying that, the AFI, though it was created by the Endowment, and though the Endowment has been consistently our most prominent champion and financial supporter, that the time has come when we should, as a growing child, go our own way.

When I was a Trustee on the Council, it seemed to me that, consistently, the responsibility of the Council on the Arts was to give seed grants, specific grants, to as wide a spectrum of arts programs as could be properly discerned across the whole Nation. As the budget grew, it was possible to do this more and more comprehensively. More and more richly textured programs could be set up in every State and for every art.

In the beginning, this simply was not possible. I remember sitting in Council meetings when you would go through a list of grants that had been recommended by the staff, all of which had a proper claim on some share of the limited art dollars, and you would have to say, "Well, we will have to choose between this program to research the history of the Stradivarius violin in Massachusetts and this program to send some people to study the way a symphony orchestra should be administered in Connecticut," and you couldn't do them both.

Now, it is possible to do a great deal and, I think quite properly, the Endowment seeks to fund the arts as widely as possible in as many areas as possible, both in the arts and geographically across the whole United States. Increasingly, we seem to be a unique and special case for the Endowment. I think under both Chairman Stevens and, now, Chairman Hanks—it has been recognized that we had some sort of a special relationship because they made us, they created us.

We were given, unlike, I think, almost any other program or organization funded by the Endowment, a national responsibility. We

are a national organization. We have the widest kind of mandate to both, as I said in my statement, archival and educational endeavors, which, again, creates a problem for the Endowment.

I believe very few of the Endowment grants go for educational purposes, very few educational institutions are funded. One of our most important activities is the Center for Advanced Film Study. There are over 600 film schools in colleges and universities around the country.

We have a responsibility to provide a bridge between those schools and the professional film-making community. To the degree that we do that on a national level, it could be questioned whether the Endowment should fund us directly. It gets to be a very cloudy area.

Then, in addition, our goals are broad enough, the requirements—I think it is not unfair to say the national priorities that film demands of the Nation create too large a need for the Endowment to constantly have to carry it. I think we have to go our own way. It is quite true, as you say, Congressman, that whatever the Endowment feels we deserve for films, at least they have money to give us.

Their relationship with the Federal Government is sound; their funding is steadily increasing, as indeed it should. If we go our own way, we will have to make our own case and take the risks that go with it, but my conviction about the importance of film as an art and our capacity to serve those goals is sufficient that I think we can do this.

Mr. HANSEN. I am impressed with your optimism. I wish you every success. You have done, I think, a very commendable job. I have been very much impressed with what you have done as I have been with George Stevens' leadership.

It has not been too difficult to persuade me of the value of strong and rising support. I am not going to be here too much longer. I hope that my successor will be pretty impressed, but the name of the game, it seems to me, is to get the resources committed and in a continuing dependable way over a long-range, so that many of these things that take years to complete can be accomplished.

But let me say, I do wish you success, and to the extent that I can help, you may be sure of my continued support.

Thank you.

Mr. HESTON. Thank you very much, Congressman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The Chair will observe that there are some of us who think that the gentleman from Idaho will still be with us next year.

Mr. Lehman of Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have just finished a campaign, and frankly, the last thing that the voters are anticipating is another Federal agency. I am concerned a little bit as to just what your proposal would do that could not be done under the Endowment, if the Endowment had sufficient authorization and appropriation and if your group had the kind of voice within the Endowment that it deserves?

Mr. HESTON. Of course, I suppose, I am not that familiar, Congressman, with the mechanism of government. I suppose that the Congress could indeed mandate to the Endowment a blueprint of how the AFI should be funded. But I think that would be inappropriate. I think it would be an incorrect interference in the autonomy of the Endowment.

42-630—74—2

One of the initial fears that was voiced all over the land, when the Government first began to fund the arts, was that "The Government is going to start telling them how to do it, we will have a cultural Czar, who says give a grant to this and not to the other."

This has not proved to be the case. In the 7 years I spent in the Council and during the time since I spent with the AFI, if one thing has been demonstrated, it is that the lawmakers and administrative echelons of Government have kept taking elaborate pains to disassociate themselves from dictating what should or should not be done with the moneys they vote to the arts.

While, as chairman of the American Film Institute, I would be delighted, on one level, if somebody said, "Now, Ms. Hanks, we are giving you all of this money but you realize you have to give x dollars to AFI because their program really demands a lot of money," I really think that would be a mistake.

Mr. LEHMAN. I don't think I have made myself clear. I didn't mean another Government agency, but another agency as recipient of Government funds. Of course, the American Film Institute is not a Government agency.

Mr. HESTON. No; it is not a Government agency. I think we should remain—well, I understand, of course, it is not intended that this legislation create the AFI as a separate Government agency. It will be what it is now and what film institutes in other countries are, a private organization with a direct line of access in this case, to OMB, with an opportunity to plead its case, to demonstrate its needs, and we would hope, persuade the OMB and the Government that we have a legitimate claim on public moneys. That film is important enough to this country.

Now, you spoke of the understandable reluctance, Congressman, on the part of the voter, not only to countenance still another elaboration of the bureaucratic structure, which, I think, would not be true in this case because we would not be demanding a corner of the Rayburn Building or indeed any other Government structure, but the public might well also have misgivings about more tax moneys going for any program. But I submit that, film, of all the art forms, speaks not only to your constituency in Florida and in Idaho and Indiana and all over the country, but in a way that perhaps no other art does. In terms of making of film, the talents and backgrounds and intelligence of the widest possible cross-section are called on. It requires a certain kind of creative talent to be a painter, to be a novelist.

You can't be a novelist without a certain kind of education. Perhaps you can't be a script-writer either, but you can perhaps be a set designer, you can perhaps work as a cutter, and the spectrum of creative abilities, both as artists, artisans, and craftsmen that is demanded in film, is quite staggering. I think this is one of the reasons why young people attend film classes now. When I studied at Northwestern in the theater school, which was one of the most important theater schools in the country, there was no school of films. Now, it has become commonplace to have classes in film in high schools.

Mr. LEHMAN. Or any schools?

Mr. HESTON. Yes. I am sure you will find it in some of the high schools in your constituency.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have them in elementary schools now.

Mr. HESTON. Yes; and I think that speaks for itself as to the importance that America ascribes to film. That is why I am tempted to serve.

Mr. LEHMAN. You have been very persuasive. Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. Sarasin.

Mr. SARASIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Heston, it is a pleasure to see you back before us. I have several questions with regard to the funding of the program.

As I understand the background, the AFI was created because a need existed. Now, you are asking to go back to the private sector for at least one-third of the funding in this program. If the need existed before and the private sector failed to respond to the need, will they respond today?

Mr. HESTON. I think the private sector is responding increasingly to our funding requirements. The public response, for example, to our Achievement Award Dinner for James Cagney last winter was remarkable. In the television show assembled from that dinner, broadcast on CBS, I did a 10-second statement which was more or less adlibbed. I said if anyone in the television audience would like to send any sort of contribution to the AFI we would send him a program from the dinner.

It was assumed that we might get a few hundred or thousand from it. In fact, we got more than $50,000. This, of course, takes time. We are, after all, only 8 years old and the film makers we have trained are only beginning to surface in the professional world, thus triggering more significant support from the professional film-making community.

Our contacts with the public are only beginning to bear fruit in the way I just outlined.

I am not certain I responded specifically to your question. I wonder if perhaps our Director, Mr. Stevens, might comment, if I failed to be responsive.

Mr. SARASIN. I suggest we privately will have the opportunity to address that kind of question to Mr. Stevens.

Do you know, Mr. Heston, or perhaps this should be addressed to Mr. Stevens, how much money we are talking about this year?

Mr. HESTON. You mean our budget for this year?

Mr. SARASIN. Yes.

Mr. HESTON. Or what our budget might be if the legislation passes.

Mr. SARASIN. If the legislation passes.

Mr. HESTON. I think Mr. Stevens will probably have it.

Mr. SARASIN. Then I will reserve that question as well.

Mr. HESTON. Yes. I think we can give you a fuller answer on the record because I don't want to take it off the top of my head. The top of my head is often very cluttered.

Mr. SARASIN. The comment you made a moment ago I thought rather interesting when you consider the break of the AFI from the endowment. You said you believed it was an evolutionary rather than a revolutionary step and I wonder if you could expand a little more on that thought.

Mr. HESTON. Well, that statement was meant to underscore the fact that it would not establish a precedent that might be seized upon by other constituents of the NEA, because our situation is unique, our

programs are national in scope, and our requirements quite far reaching.

What I meant by saying that it was evolutionary was to say that, of course, we were created by the NEA and we were carefully and with most warm paternalism, guided and funded by the endowment; but as our needs and programs became greater, it began, as I think Miss Hanks would agree, to exceed the possibilities of what they were able to do for us without unnecessarily depriving other projects they were funding.

I remember again from when I was on the Council, everyone in the arts is very much aware of what each grantee gets from the Council. It was, for instance, a source of passionate debate as to why a symphony orchestra required a grant of $125,000 when a grant for a program to fund poetry only amounted to a total of $35,000 for the same State, and you had to go through elaborate lines of argument pointing out that symphonies were simply more expensive than poetry was, and that you couldn't say that because symphonies get $125,000 poets have to get $125,000.

Well, film is the most expensive of all art forms, even more expensive than ballet and symphonies, especially if you have a national film institution. Their proper demands are obviously enormously higher. Nevertheless, if you meet those demands—and I am not saying that the NEA meets those demands—all of the other grantees who are receiving grants from NEA wonder why, asking, "If you can't afford to give us this and this that we have asked for, how can you give all of that money to the American Film Institute?"

Mr. SARASIN. I thank you for that comment.

One of the aspects of the AFI and one that interests me is the preservation of the historical art form.

Mr. HESTON. I think this is enormously important.

Mr. SARASIN. Do you feel you have been successful in that area? I suppose if you had not done anything nothing would have been done and I guess I answered my own question.

Mr. HESTON. I think it is fair to say, we were like the cavalry, we barely arrived in the nick of time. Our archival program is a good microcosmic example of the belated and just in time nature of the sudden public awareness, national awareness, that film is a vital cultural asset.

When we began our archival program to rescue important American films there were—what was the precentage there of the films that had disappeared?

Mr. STEVENS. About half.

Mr. HESTON. More than half of the films made in this country no longer existed, half of the films. Now I am not speaking of "Abbott and Costello," "Meet Frankenstein," or the unimportant early "Blondie and Dagwood," but, as an offhand example, it was discovered when we began our program to rescue American films that no print of John Ford's "Stagecoach," one of the most important films in the world, existed. No 35-millimeter prints. Everybody said, I saw it on the television just last week. What they saw on television was a 16-millimeter print; of course, grievously less effective in photographic quality than a full 35-millimeter print and also printed for television.

Through great good luck we finally located a 35-millimeter print of "Stagecoach" in John Wayne's garage in mint condition. We have just rescued more than 8,000 films which are now on deposit in the National Library of Congress.

This is one of our less known programs and perhaps not as exciting as training young filmmakers and seeing them enter the filmmaking world or opening a theater in Kennedy Center where the public can go and see little known movies every day. But perhaps in the long perspective it will prove to be one of the most important things we have done.

I might also point out it is one of the most expensive things we have done. We could do far more than we have done if we had more money. We could take more money for the archival program alone, to do it properly—than Mrs. Hanks would justifiably be able to give us for our whole activity.

The horizons of responsibility expanding ahead of a properly constituted and organized and funded American Film Institute are almost incomprehensible.

I have been carrying on at great lengths about what film is, the medium of our time, the art of our country, and so on, but I think we have only begun to see the surface of what film will be in 20-, 30-, or 50-years time.

I think it almost uniquely among the arts will be a tool as well. We have only begun to see what film can do to teach, to educate, to communicate.

There will be someday not 5, 7, or 13 channels on our television sets but 50, on one of which you can study Greek and on another of which you can study how to tie trout flies or tat a rug or splint a broken arm.

All of this potential, I think, can only be properly realized if there is some kind of a national governmental response to the needs and potentials.

It can't be left merely as a haphazard commercial development and I think the American Film Institute is the proper agency to serve in communicating with the various sectors of films and the public and government that serves all of them.

Mr. Sarbanes. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

Mr. Brademas. Mr. Quie.

Mr. Quie. I don't want to ask any questions.

I would like to welcome him.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you very much, Mr. Heston. We appreciate you taking the time to be with us.

Mr. Heston. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I may, I would like at this point to introduce our vice chairman, Mr. John Schneider, who came down from New York.

Mr. Brademas. We are pleased to see you, Mr. Schneider.

But before he begins, I would ask unanimous consent to insert in the record the text of statements with respect to the legislation from Mr. Robert Wise, from Dennis Weaver, president of Screen Actors Guild, from Roy B. White, chairman of the National Association of Theater Owners, and from Dr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., the renowned American historian.

[The statements follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT WISE, PRESIDENT, SCREEN DIRECTORS GUILD

I am an enthusiastic supporter of The American Film Institute, and only the fact that I am in production in California on my film The Hindenburg prevents me from accepting your invitation to testify before this Committee.

As a member of the National Council on the Arts, I made a detailed study of the origins of The American Film Institute dating back to Lyndon Johnson's message at the time of the creation of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities in 1965, when he said:

"We will create an American Film Institute, bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators, and young men and women who wish to pursue the Twentieth Century art form as their life's work."

Mr. Johnson's dream of an American film institute has been brought to life by a dedicated group of professional people supported by the federal government through the National Endowment for the Arts and with growing support from the private sector.

I have been exposed to the work of the Institute first-hand by the presence of AFI interns who have been assigned to observe the work on my productions in a learning capacity. I have seen the progress of the Center for Advanced Film Studies which has become, in a relatively short period of time, a national conservatory which provides high quality, advanced training for new artists. I have observed with pride and satisfaction the successful preservation of the classic films which were in danger of decay and which are such an important part of our American heritage.

The American Film Institute must be given assured continuity and funding to maintain these and other worthwhile programs. AFI's work as an operational national organization with direct funding from the Congress can complement the grant making functions of the National Endowment for the Arts and assure the enrichment of film and television in the future. I urge the passage of this bill which promises the stability and dependable funding which The American Film Institute sorely needs and richly deserves.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DENNIS WEAVER, PRESIDENT, SCREEN ACTORS GUILD

The Screen Actors Guild, a union of 29,000 actors, has watched with interest the growth and development of The American Film Institute as an important national film institution.

During the past two years, the Guild and the AFI have created a joint training program which has proved beneficial and effective. We recognize the importance of The American Film Institute to the art of film and television in the United States, and we commend the Committee's action in undertaking to make it a permanent institution with dependable funding.

OCTOBER 4, 1974.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman,
House Select Subcommittee on Education.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your important hearings on legislation to permanently create The American Film Institute coincides exactly with the opening of the annual convention of the National Association of Theater Owners in Atlanta, Georgia. At our convention, approximately two thousand theater owners from every one of the fifty states will be present. These men and women have, by experience, grown to appreciate and value the work of The American Film Institute which has been exceptional and of uniquely high quality.

We have pledged our cooperation to this effort through National Film Day, which provides revenues for AFI. I hope the Committee and the entire Congress will act favorably on this legislation. The United States, more than any nation, has contributed to the art of film which has presence in every community of our country. This fact should be recognized by giving permanent status to the Institute so that it may continue its work to foster excellence in film for the benefit of the American public.

ROY B. WHITE,
Chairman,
National Association of Theater Owners.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR., AMERICAN HISTORIAN

I regret very much that academic commitments at the City University of New York prevent my offering testimony in person on the bill to establish the American Film Institute as an independent agency of the federal government. I would like, however, to express my strong hope that the bill will receive favorable consideration by your committee.

It has always seemed to me, as an American historian, an anomaly that the United States, which has contributed more than any other nation to the rise of the film both as an art and as an industry, should have done so little in a systematic and public way to provide either for the past or the future of the American film. The logical way to make such provision is through the establishment of a national film institute charged both with preserving and analyzing the achievements of the past and with training the film makers of the future. This is what a number of nations have already done with signal success—Great Britain, Canada, Sweden, Italy, Poland, the Soviet Union, for example.

American film makers, despite their primacy in the world of movie-making, tended for many years to regard the past and the future of their art with sublime indifference, apparently supposing that the past did not matter and that the future would take care of itself. In the great days of Hollywood, astonishingly little was done either to preserve the American film heritage or to organize training in the craft of film-making. No doubt this indifference contributed to the decline of Hollywood in more recent times. When the American Film Institute came on the scene seven years ago, it found the archival situation in staggering disarray and the training situation scattered and uncoordinated. In these seven years, under the strong and imaginative direction of George Stevens, Jr. the AFI has built up and modernized the Library of Congress holdings in American films, begun a comprehensive descriptive catalogue of all films produced in the United States, established a Center for Advanced Film Studies in Los Angeles and organized classic film programs for the Kennedy Center in Washington. It has worked closely with the American film industry and with the film departments in American colleges and universities. It has also worked closely with national film institutes in other countries. As one who served for a term on the AFI board of trustees, I can attest to the earnestness and proficiency with which the Institute has conceived and discharged its several missions.

The proposal that the AFI now be established as an independent agency of the federal government seems to me the logical next step. Such an action would do long overdue justice to the single art form to which the United States has made an indispensable contribution. The history of painting, of music, of scripture, of the dance would not be much affected if the American contribution were subtracted from the whole; this can hardly be said of the history of the film. Moreover, this action would help bring forward the young directors, writers and cinematographers on whom our hope of regaining American film primacy in the future depends. It would give the Institute the strength and continuity to carry forward its work in the years to come.

I would lay particular emphasis on the word "independent" in this proposal. I note some reference in the debate to the idea of ensuring "that the Institute is responsive to the needs and policy directives of Federal officials." I trust that this language is not meant literally; for the Institute, while it must recognize its broad accountability to the federal government and to the Congress, can hardly do a proper job if it is at the daily mercy of the "policy directives" of federal officials. It must enjoy precisely the same independence, and the same accountability, as the National Gallery or the Smithsonian Institution or the Kennedy Center. Neither the executive nor the legislative branch should expect, for example, to have an item veto over the ongoing activities of the Institute any more than they should be able to decide what pictures are to be hung in the federal galleries or what orchestras should play at the Kennedy Center. I am sure that the composition of the Board of Trustees, as prescribed in the bill, will help guarantee the proper mix of independence and accountability.

By enacting this bill, Congress would act in the spirit expressed by George Washington in his first annual message in 1790:

"Nor am I less persuaded that you will agree with me in opinion that there is nothing which can better deserve your patronage than the promotion of science

and literature . . . Whether this desirable object will be best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients will be well worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature."

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Schneider, it is very good to see you with us again today and we look forward to hearing from you.

STATEMENT OF JOHN A. SCHNEIDER, PRESIDENT, CBS BROADCAST GROUP, ACTOR-PRODUCER

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I am appearing before you as vice chairman of the American Film Institute.

During the 2 days of hearings scheduled for this bill, you will hear from many other witnesses who will address themselves to the character of the American Film Institute, as it now exists, and to the services it renders to its many constituencies.

Perhaps the spirit of the American Film Institute can best be understood by examining its board of trustees. As you might expect, the performing arts are represented by: Charlton Heston, Warren Beatty, Cicely Tyson, and Shirley MacLaine.

The educational interests of the film art form are represented by: David Mallery from Philadelphia. David will be appearing later. Daniel Boorstin from Washington, D.C., Larry Jordan from San Francisco, and Raymond Fielding, also from Philadelphia.

As you might expect the filmmakers are represented and they are represented by: David Brown whose most recent effort was "The Sting" and who is now finishing postproduction work on a film based on the best selling novel, "Jaws." John Korty who is on the board and who directed "The Autobiography of Miss Jane Pittman." Ed Emshwiller, who will be appearing later, is one of the most distinguished experimental filmmakers. William Friedkin, one of the brightest young directors on the American scene. John Hancock, who directed "Bang the Drum Slowly," among others, and who received his funds from AFI. John will also appear later.

In the past year, we have had on our board the studio heads of Warner Brothers, Paramount Pictures, 20th Century-Fox and United Artists.

The television industry has been represented by Barry Diller, of ABC, who just last week was elected chairman of Paramount Pictures; Joan Ganz Cooney, president of Children's Television Workshop, producer of "Sesame Street" and the "Electric Company," and by me.

Writers and critics are represented by Shana Alexander and Eleanor Perry, and exhibitors are represented by Roy White, president, Mid States Theatres, which headquarters in Cincinnati, and former president of the National Association of Theater Owners; Richard Brandt, president, Trans Lux Corp., and our executive committee chairman, and he will also appear later; and Paul Roth, president, National Association of Theater Owners.

When wise counsel is needed that cannot be drawn from the distinguished list of citizens just enumerated, we can draw on the brilliant counsel of such public spirited attorneys as Paul Ziffren, Harry McPherson, and Deane Johnson.

Of course, the next two gentlemen defy categorization. Roger Stevens, who is perhaps best known in Washington as the first chair-

man of the National Arts Endowment and is currently chairman of Kennedy Center; and John Macy, who has a distinguished record of public service.

As you can see, it is a blend of private fundraisers, professional experts, independent filmmakers and educators, et cetera.

You would think that this kind of board would be hard to get to meetings, but the fact is that over the past 6 years we have had an average of three meetings per year and our attendance record has been approximately 85 percent. This board has been the driving force that has given the American Film Institute its spirit, its style, and its character.

This bill has proposed that the new board of trustees would be composed of 7 ex officio members of the executive branch, 4 Members of Congress and 12 members from the private sector, appointed by the existing American Film Institute Board.

With a board of such distinction as I have just outlined, you have given us a difficult task indeed to cut the number to 12. We, of course, could readily do that.

I endorse the proposal that the private sector continue to hold a majority on this board. Federal support of the work of the American Film Institute is vital, however the combination of private support and a majority on the board of trustees from the private sector is critical if we are to maintain our credibility in the creative community. The representatives from the private sector can produce not only this credibility but can provide fundraising energies as well.

In the 7 years of the American Film Institute's existence, private contributions and philanthropy have amounted to some $10 million, not to mention the countless hours of professional talent that have been selflessly contributed.

Our present board is a large one, numbering some 38 trustees. It is an active board, it is a dedicated board, it is a fundraising board, it is a board with a high level of attendance and participation, a board that serves without remuneration and a board which pays its own way. You are preceding us with an awesome challenge—the challenge to cut this board down to 12 members.

I will recommend that we revise the structure of our advisory committee system in such a way as to maintain the involvement of those trustees who cannot be incorporated within the new board to be certain that these people are not lost to us.

The 12 surviving trustees will be a microcosm of our present board which, when joined by the 7 members of the executive branch and the 4 Representatives from Congress, will most certainly be able to provide new and vital leadership for the American Film Institute.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you very much, Mr. Schneider.

Let me just ask you a couple of questions.

Mr. Bolton was commenting upon the support for the American Film Institute from the motion picture industry. I wonder if you could comment upon the support, past and present and future, from the television industry in the country to the work of the AFI?

Mr. Schneider. Well, the CBS has supported AFI from its beginning with semi-annual grants of some 3 years subsequently renewed.

The extent of that support offhand is somewhere in the neighborhood of $300,000 or $400,000 from CBS. The American Broadcasting

Company similarly has had a long-standing pledge. It is a pledge of several years duration and has been renewed for another 3-year period.

I would say ABC's support has been in excess of one-quarter of a million dollars all told.

In addition, the industry has provided time, equipment, professional support for our work at Gray-stone as well as the Life Achievement Broadcast which has become such an important fundraiser and such an important contribution to having AFI come full-blown on the American scene, having it acquire the credibility I think we need with the public at large. I think that was a great step in that direction.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Schneider, one of the important programs of the institute is its archival effort and I wonder if you could tell the subcommittee what structure exists or is contemplated, for preserving television films, films in particular such as your own "Autobiography of Miss Jane Pittman," films that have been produced for television? Is the television industry going to cooperate in any way in respect of the preservation of such films with the archival program of AFI?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. That requires a two-part answer, Mr. Chairman. With the funds AFI has had available, the priority had to go to the deteriorating films and the traditional theatrical film form.

As has been mentioned earlier, there is a meter running on that material and it is still deteriorating. As we can get behind that problem, AFI has a pilot program which is addressing itself to the preservation of television material, at least on a sample basis before that material is lost.

However, the form in which the television material exists, be it contemporary film stock or video tape, is not in a deteriorating condition as is theatrical film from the pre-1940's, I believe it is.

So that there is a project, the industry is ready to participate and cooperate with AFI, and whether AFI would be the sole repositor or not, we stand ready to help.

You must understand that it is important work for AFI because the networks do not own most of the products that they broadcast. They are owned by the filmmaker who holds title, so that the negative and the important print material from that negative repose in the possession of the copyright proprietor.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to find out a little more on your testimony about the board, Mr. Schneider. Mr. Brademas talks about this legislation, and this is one of the things that concerns me. You mention that it is likely the majority will be private individuals, from the film industry.

In looking at the nonprofit corporations that exist presently, there is quite a variety of means by which they are appointed. I notice that the American National Red Cross, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the Smithsonian Institution are three that might have some similarity to what you are talking about with AFI having direct Federal relations.

The American National Red Cross has 50 members of the board of governors. Thirty are by chapters, and 12 by the board itself and 8 by the President. That may be different because there are chapters in

all of the States. You don't anticipate anything that large, although presently you have quite a large board in the film institute that would be reduced down to the 12 private members and the rest on an advisory basis.

The 15 members of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, are all appointed by the President. The Smithsonian Institution members are the President and Vice President, Chief Justice, and Members of the Cabinet. The Board of Regents is the Vice President, Chief Justice, three Senators, three Congressmen, and six private citizens appointed by joint resolution of Congress, so there is a variety.

What we intended to do on grants that are made available to private organizations is for the Congress to put the money in the hands of some executive branch agency or quasi-governmental agency who would, in turn, contract out.

I understand that what AFI would do is both operate programs themselves and contract out. I will go to that later on. Two-thirds of the money would be provided by the Federal Government so that the taxpayers are looking for a way of assuring that two-thirds of the money would be administered the way they would want it to be administered.

According to this you would have two-thirds of the public appointees and one-third private. We are dealing with a subject matter here that is a lot different than perhaps the Red Cross but it does have some similarity to public broadcasting and the Smithsonian Institution as well.

How do you see us protecting the public interests?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. We have advocated that the private sector have this slim majority of 12 to 11, the private sector being represented by 12. We think it is vital to maintain the credibility of the American Film Institute in a creative community, otherwise there will be a suspicion that we will never catch up with, that this is a Government-funded project that will have influence over the creative content of the material produced as a result of that funding.

Even with the limited, though important, amount of funding that we have received through NEA, there were segments of the film community that were suspicious of some judgments that we had to make over the past years, presuming that we were dancing on a string that was being pulled by the executive or the legislators, and I think if our work is to go on, to go forward and be exciting and stimulating in a creative area, we have to absolutely be in a position to guarantee to those who are that paranoid that we are not under Government control.

Mr. QUIE. Is there any problem in the feeling that the 12 might then be controlled by one segment? I assume there is the same kind of controversy existing in American filmaking as in everything else. There is politics within the organization. How do you prevent that from happening?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. As I understand the legislation, the initial 12 will be selected from the existing board, but subsequent to that, the board of 23 will be designated its successors, so that even if there were mischief in the initial activity or politicians or bloc organizations, that would be correctable within 2 years, because some members of the initial 12 will only have a 2-year term at which point the full board of 23 would act on its successors.

Mr. QUIE. Does that give more concern to the internal politicians, or more concern that governmental imposition and the paranoia that you have mentioned would be too great?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. It is not anticipated that any board activity would break down on the 12 and 11 lines and if it does break down that way then we will have all failed.

Mr. QUIE. But the question really comes from your answer. If the paranoia exists and the board does decide that the 12 will be selected by the board of trustees of the American Film Institute, they would probably pick 1 of the 12 that presently exist, and then all 23 would join in on it.

Do you think there would be a feeling that there is ample freedom of expression then with that makeup of the board?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Quie, I am not saying that the Board, with those Government representatives, is going to be an inhibiting factor. I am stressing, and I want to go on to say, I am not anticipating that those 11 would be men that would be without good will, men that would be insensitive to the creative needs.

What I am saying is there are certain members of the film constituency that we are going to be organized to serve, that would never get beyond the construction of the Board before there suspicions would be inhibiting and indeed paralyzing.

In addition, these 12 men will have a fund-raising obligation. They will know that as they accept their appointments, as they have known that as they accepted their appointments in the past.

I think I am enthusiastic and I support the structure as it has been proposed and I think it is one that can work.

Mr. QUIE. Let me go down the line of public members of that 12-member Board. We don't know who the Senate and House will appoint, so we can't talk about them.

On the boards we find the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts who are involved in similar programs, and the Secretary of the Interior who has programs operated by that Department. The same situation is found with the John F. Kennedy Center of Performing Arts, and the Archivist of the United States, and the Library of Congress all are involved with programs that have some similarity of interest.

What about the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare? Do you think it is important that he be a member?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. It is one function, the educational function that is part of the AFI goals and charter.

Mr. QUIE. Yes. Would you look at that person as then being involved in providing money for grants that would come out of the various educational programs in the Office of Education?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. He does not now. We are eligible to receive grants from sources other than through NEA and if he became familiar with our work and we were deserving of such grants, that, of course, is a possibility.

Mr. QUIE. That would be the purpose of that individual being there?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Well, I would stress, sir, it would relate to the educational aspects. We do perceive ourselves as an educational operation.

Mr. QUIE. Let me ask you, what would be the connection of Graystone with this new AFI grant? Would it be a part of or separate from? I have a Washington Star News article of Wednesday, August 7, reporting Frank Dannielle had resigned. How do you anticipate under the new AFI that Graystone would be related? Would it be related the same as it has been in the past?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. There is no new concept?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. No new concept at all. The thrust of Frank Dannielle was the kind of thing that those who had experience in dealing with educational institutions would find not unusual.

Mr. Heston referred earlier to it as a no-end situation when you have some poor little fellow from academia taking on the establishment, but I am sure many of you on the committee have had experience with educational institutions—the chairman serves on a board, the advisory committee, and I suspect others of you do serve as well. From our view of the sixties we have a point of view that has been honed and it is rather more sophisticated now than before that time and I think it would enable you all to place that little flap in perspective.

Mr. QUIE. When the two endowments come up for funding in the Congress, they do pretty well in the increasing amount of money that becomes available to them each year, but it is not without controversy. We have a considerable battle on the floor of the House, which the chairman and I are familiar with. We usually have our fingers crossed that we will get what we asked for, even though we have been pleased in the past with the way it happened.

AFI has, in effect, benefitted then from NEA's good reputation with the Congress in getting an increase in money. You won't be able to depend on any additional amount of money. You will be on your own.

My last question is, with your experience with Members of Congress, do you look to the possibility of getting more Federal money when you are on your own?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. It is a very difficult question to answer, but I suspect that the Congress will act with wisdom and good will, as they have in the past.

Mr. QUIE. I guess that would be the hope.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Schneider.

We appreciate your having taken the time to be with us for your valuable testimony. The chair recognizes Mr. Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have just one brief remark. I think that some of the controversy we often meet on the floor, with the other endowment appropriations and authorizations, is that we don't reach a wide enough spread of citizens with perhaps ballet and poetry, which I would guess accounts for 5, 10 or 15 or 20 percent of the people. But certainly our films are viewed by 60, 70, even 80 percent of the people in this country, I think, over a period of time.

I think I would look forward to a more enthusiastic reception in the Congress to this kind of legislation than I would on some of the other forms of art I am quite interested in the archives portion of your work.

I am amazed with all of the technical and scientific ability we have in this country, that we couldn't find something in any appropriation that we make for your Institute to find better means to maintain the films that have become part of our historical culture.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. We have the skills, Mr. Lehman. We have the technology. We simply need the money.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is what I was hoping for.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Sarasin.

Mr. SARASIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Schneider, I wish to thank you, too.

I join Mr. Brademas in cosponsoring this legislation, and I think it is a worthy piece of legislation, but I am disturbed a little bit by one of your comments in answer to a question of Mr. Quie's.

That was with reference to the majority of private members on the board and the suspicion that it might create.

You know, I tend to react negatively to that and have a feeling, if that is the way they are going to feel, the heck with them, we won't give them any money.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. It is not the feeling of those in this room representing AFI. It is not the feeling of the existing board of trustees. I am addressing myself to the concern of a creative community which I think is suspicious against management, suspicious against anybody providing funds.

The question is, when it is Government funded, does he who pays the piper call the tune?

We have had several occasions in the past few years to make some policy decisions at AFI with certain elements in the film community, the independent filmmakers, the experimental filmmakers, the young people in film schools that are hot.

Here they go dancing to that tune. They holler, here they go dancing to that tune. We never catch up with it and what we are trying to do is institutionally insulate that suspicion from being implanted so deeply from the very genesis that your credibility and the credibility of the work we intend to do and that the credibility of the work you intend to support would simply never get established.

The trustees are not suspicious.

Mr. SARASIN. I am not sure that changes my negative feeling. My concern is, and I know you are not saying this, that it seems to appear that because Government is involved, therefore, it lacks credibility. Of course being a part of Government, I take some slight offense at that.

I know that is not your meaning. But you are asking us in this legislation to provide two-thirds of the funding and I am not saying that that means that we should automatically have two-thirds of the board or even a majority, but the reasoning for asking for a majority of private individuals on the board I would still like to have clarified, I think.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I would desperately like to come up with an answer that would satisfy you. I am not certain I can do so.

Fundraising will be enhanced by that majority as well. There are people in the creative community that may have this unfortunate irresponsible paranoid attitude that we want to draw on and I just think it creates a more healthy climate for the work that we are going to do if we have a majority.

Mr. Sarasin, let me also identify with you on this because I represent the management side of the performing arts and they are, or the creative people are just as suspicious of me and my motives each and every day. So I understand your concern.

Mr. Sarasin. Welcome to the club. I am really concerned about that. I suppose there is no reason to dwell on it, but the attitude of "we" and "they" situation does bother me.

Mr. Schneider. They think we are trying to buy their love.

Mr. Sarasin. Under the terms of the bill, you are to take for your present board 12 members, and may I ask you, without getting involved in personalities, has the board as presently constituted been an active board because they all work hard?

Mr. Schneider. Our attendance has been about 82, 83. I would say approximately 85 percent and that has been the attendance at an average of three board meetings a year, with, as a rule, one in Washington and two in California.

The constituency is national, Roy White from Cincinnati, and people from San Francisco, Philadelphia and Washington, from all over the country. They get there. They are working board meetings, not ceremonial.

We have been struggling for our very existence because of financial problems. It is active in a committee structure. We have three or four committees that meet much more often than the three times a year the full board of trustees meets.

It is a constituent board. I spelled out in detail that there is a constituency, whether they are independent filmmakers, educators, writers, critics, producers, directors, or performers or exhibitors.

We believe that every, or virtually every, constituency is represented.

Mr. Sarasin. Fine.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have no further questions.

Mr. Brademas. I might just observe, following the colloquy between Mr. Sarasin and Mr. Schneider, that the bill does provide, with respect to the private members of the board, a requirement of confirmation by the full House of Representatives and the full Senate.

This is an unusual provision, I might observe, but one of the reasons that those of us who were shaping this bill thought the requirement wise was to assure the public accountability of which Mr. Sarasin, I think, was quite properly speaking.

Thank you, Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Quie. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Brademas. I yield.

Mr. Quie. Also in support of the concept. The Smithsonian has six private citizens appointed by joint resolution of Congress, so we have a precedent for that.

Mr. Brademas. Yes.

I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

We shall next hear from Miss Nancy Hanks, and the Chair would be grateful, if it is posible, if both Miss Hanks and Mr. Stevens, who will follow Miss Hanks, would be able to summarize their testimony for us, in view of the fact there are a couple of witnesses after them. We want to be sure they have ample time to make their views known, because the House will be in session at noon.

We are very pleased today to have you with us, Miss Hanks, and, indeed, we are always pleased to have you before the subcommittee.

[Miss Hanks' prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF NANCY HANKS, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS; CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

The National Endowment for the Arts was established in 1965 by Public Law 89-209. Film was listed as one of the arts which the Endowment was authorized to assist, and in signing the legislation, President Lyndon B. Johnson stated:

"We will create an American Film Institute bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators, and young men and women who wish to pursue their twentieth century art form as their life's work."

In furtherance of the President's directive, the Endowment, in 1966, commissioned the Stanford Research Institute to prepare a report on an American Film Institute. The report was submitted in February 1967, and was accepted in principle by the Endowment's advisory body, the National Council on the Arts. In summary, it held that the principal aims of an American Film Institute should be: To develop incentives for better U.S. films; to promote greater recognition for film as an art; to foster training programs and increased opportunities for film artists; and to preserve artistic achievement by means of film archives and libraries.

The Report continued:

"To accomplish these aims, it appears vital that the AFI be able to achieve and maintain:

"A perspective for film in all of its artistic variations . . ."

"An organizational framework that will provide for a centralized focus on matters relating to film . . ."

"Sufficient stature and concentration of effort to be effective and to earn respect . . ."

"Permanent and stable sources of financial support . . ."

The Report proposed that the institute be established as a nonprofit, nongovernmental agency, "serving as a national center for progress in film art and supporting other organizations and agencies involved in related activities." It further proposed that, for the purpose of consolidating "all aspects pertaining to the film arts in a single organization", the AFI be directly aligned with the National Council on the Arts.

The Report did not indicate in precise terms how this alignment should be shaped. Nor, in 1966 would it have been easy to make any such determination. The total budget of the National Endowment for the Arts in that year was less than the "preliminary annual budget" of "approximately $8.5 million", recommended by the Stanford Research Institute as necessary for the projected film institute.

In terms of structure the Report held that:

"Either a congressionally chartered or publicly incorporated non-profit organization probably would be suitable for the American Film Institute. Congressional Charters have been granted to the National Safety Council, the American National Theater and Academy and the National Academy of Science. Publicly held non profit corporations include the Tennessee Valley Authority, . . . Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. It would be important for the charter to clearly identify the national character and the public interest of the (institute), provide for private, nongovernmental control, and permit combining financial support from a variety of sources."

In terms of funding, the Report pointed to three sources of support, foundations, the government and the film industry. It held that foundations were "probably not a stable or consistent source of permanent and substantial financing . . ." It added that "with its present limitation on funding, the National Endowment for the Arts could not continue to provide substantial assistance . . ." It noted that, if the film industry contributed the five percent of taxable income that was deductible to the Institute, this would amount to "between $5 million and $10 million a year."

The American Film Institute was incorporated on March 2, 1967. The formal announcement of the Institute was made by Roger Stevens, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, on June 5, 1967. He noted that the National

Endowment for the Arts and the Ford Foundation had each made equal commitments of $1.3 million towards a three year budget. He added that seven member companies of the Motion Picture Association of America had committed an additional $1.3 million. He declared:

"The National Council on the Arts hopes to be able to provide additional financial assistance to the Film Institute in coming years, but, if this is to be a truly national effort, then we must achieve full support from the private sector as well."

The attached table indicates sources of income of the American Film Institute. While many developments are reflected in this table, it will be seen that, in summary, support provided by the Ford Foundation was terminated in the manner foreseen in general terms by the Stanford Research Institute Report; support from the film industry did not develop the potential foreseen by the Report during the period under review, and support from the National Endowment for the Arts exceeded the expectations set forth in the Report.

It will be noted further that, from 1972 on, grants and contracts provided by the Endowment, amounted to more than one half of the annual income of the American Film Institute. This is a point which calls for further examination.

Section 5 (c) of Public Law 89-209 as amended states that not more than 50 percent of the cost of any project or production may be funded by an Endowment grant. Twenty percent of the program funds of the Endowment are exempt from this requirement.

In requesting $2 million from the Endowment for Fiscal 1972 the Institute presented a total budget for the year of $1,383,000. This budget proved to be unrealistic in its projection of income from non-governmental sources. By early 1972 it was apparent that the Institute would have to obtain more than 50 percent of its income from the Endowment, or else severely curtail its activities. The National Council on the Arts, after an extensive review of this situation, recommended that a matching grant of $1,000,000 be considered for the Institute for Fiscal 1973, and that a challenge grant of an additional $200,000 be offered to the Institute on a one to one matching basis.

The Council further recommended that the Endowment contract with the Institute to carry out programs in support of filmmaker fellowships and film preservation, activities which had formerly been included as part of the basic grant. The Endowment, acting on the recommendation of the National Council on the Arts, has continued this approach of combining grants and contracts in its relationship with the American Film Institute.

The difficulties experienced by the Institute in generating increased support from the film industry or other private sources has made it difficult for the Institute to match on a one to one basis the grant sums provided by the Endowment. The National Council on the Arts, under these circumstances, recommended that the matching requirements of the Endowment be eased temporarily to meet the difficulties of the Institute. This modification in the relationship between the Endowment and the Institute was reviewed by the Select Subcommittee on Education. Its Report, submitted to the House Committee on Education and Labor in 1973, and accepted by the Committee, noted that:

"Because it is a recipient of substantial grants from the National Endowment for the Arts, the Committee gave particular attention to the funding relationships between the American Film Institute and the Endowment. Specifically, we noted that AFI receives somewhat more than 50 percent of its total budget from the National Endowment for the Arts while most other Endowment grantees are limited to a dollar-for-dollar ratio between its private and Federal funds.

"Because the AFI is a creation of the Endowment, rather than, as with other grantees, a private entity seeking Federal funds, the Committee believes the AFI should continue to have this funding relationship with the Endowment.

"In this regard, the Committee would stress that the authorizing language for the National Endowment for the Arts permits the Endowment to waive the matching requirements which accompany Endowment contributions.

"We believe the AFI should continue to expand its private fund-raising sources, but we recognize that many of its programs, such as those in film and television archives development, will require primary funding by the Endowment. For such reasons, the Committee urges the Endowment to waive the matching requirements when necessary, in connection with the American Film Institute."

The Endowment, of course, welcomed this statement of the Subcommittee. At the same time, it should be noted that the National Council on the Arts has repeatedly stated that it regards the matching provisions contained in Public Law

42-830—74——3

20(-80 as indispensable to the successful operation of the Endowment, and regards the waiver of the matching provisions in the case of the American Film Institute as a temporary measure, and one which should be permitted to last only for a limited time. It should be further noted that almost without exception Endowment funding of arts organizations nowhere approaches a one to one or 50% match and only in rare and special instances is a grant made for general operating purposes.

In concluding this brief historical summary, a word should be said about the Endowment's support of film projects other than the American Film Institute.

While supporting the Institute with increasing funds, the Endowment has, since its inception, maintained its own Public Media Program. The Program, which began at a level of $788,300 in Fiscal 1967, was reduced in size until, in Fiscal 1970, it amounted to only $195,000. At the same time the Endowment received appeals for support in increasing numbers from film-related projects. In May 1971, the National Council on the Arts, after recommending that $1 million be allocated to the American Film Institute in Fiscal 1972, recommended further that an additional $1 million be allocated in grants made by the Endowment in the public media field. The Public Media Program has subsequently expanded, and is currently administering $3,368,926 in grants in Fiscal 1975 in addition to funds to the AFI.

Thus, three categories of support can be distinguished in the Endowment's program to assist the art of film:

Grants to the American Film Institute, principally in support of the Institute's Center for Advanced Film Studies, and not including the AFI Theatre in Washington.

Contracts with the American Film Institute in support of film preservation and of filmmakers fellowships.

Grants-in-aid, administered by the Endowment in support of film, television and radio, including programs in programming of the arts on television, regional center development, cooperative projects with the Corporation for Public Programming, short film showcasing, media studies, fellowships and internships. In all of these areas, applications have exceeded greatly the sums available under the Endowment's programs, and experience has shown that the Endowment is looked to by the field, for continuing programs in support of creative endeavors that are expanding rapidly all over the country.

All of these programs have been carried out through the Public Media Program of the Endowment, on the advice of the National Council on the Arts and its own Public Media Panel. However, this Panel since its inception in 1972, has at no time reviewed the budgets and activities of the American Film Institute. Relationships with the Institute have been guided over the past three years by a special Film Committee of the National Council on the Arts. Currently the Film Committee has recommended to the Chairman that it be dissolved, and that review of the budget and activities of the American Film Institute be turned over to the Panel in accordance with the practice followed in all other programs of the Endowment. Presumably, the Panel will review with the staff of the Endowment the Fiscal 1976 budget submissions of the American Film Institute should the Institute apply for funds in that year.

II.

Representatives of the Endowment and of the Institute have met on many occasions over the past five years to consider the future of the Institute and of film, seen as an art. The following assumptions have generally been accepted:

Film is an important art form; one which deserves continuing and substantial public support.

The American Film Institute is fulfilling an important role in service to the art of film.

The American Film Institute while exerting every effort to generate income from non-governmental sources, cannot look forward in the immediate future, to contributions from these sources equal to, or more than, the total presently assigned to the Institute by the Endowment in grants and in contracts.

The 'preliminary annual budget' of $8.5 million originally projected for the Institute by the Stanford Research Institute was made up of a wide variety of services. Some of these are being carried out at present by the Institute, some are being funded directly by the Endowment, some are carried on without public support, and some have simply not developed in the manner foreseen by the Stanford Research Institute.

Given the limitations set by its overall budget, and the relationship of the Council to the principle of matching grants, the Endowment is unlikely to significantly increase the grants given to the American Film Institute in the immediate future. It is, on the contrary, committed to the view that the present waiver of the matching provision is a temporary expedient, and that the Institute must generate increased revenues from private sources if it is to anticipate receiving as much from the Endowment in the future as it is allocated in grants in this fiscal year.

III.

Given these considerations, the Board of Trustees of the American Film Institute has, with the Endowment's knowledge and cooperation, investigated courses for the future other than continued dependence upon the Endowment. The legislation now before the Select Subcommittee is one such alternative. It is, of course, for the Congress to determine whether the American Film Institute should be funded by annual appropriations directly sought from the Congress. I should point out that under the proposed legislation there are a number of technical questions as to the organizational and funding arrangements for the Institute. I defer to the views of the Civil Service Commission and the Office of Management and Budget on these issues. I would also note the Endowment's views do not at this time necessarily represent the position of the Administration on the desirability of establishing direct federal funding for the Institute.

In commenting upon the legislation the Endowment wishes to emphasize its adherence to three continuing principles:

(1) The National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Council on the Arts, are wholly committed to the view that all of the arts must be seen as a single constituency. While the Congress may choose to recognize the special circumstances surrounding the American Film Institute, the Endowment and the Council wish to reaffirm their belief that film is an integral segment of the arts constituency, and that the creation, under the proposed legislation, of an independent film institute, funded directly by the Congress should not be seen as a precedent to be followed by other cultural organizations.

(2) In an effort to define more precisely the independent status of the American Film Institute, and at the same time to preserve a unified approach to all of the arts, it has at times been suggested that Public Law 89-209 as amended be amended further to create a special title within the law, permitting the American Film Institute to be funded as a line item in the Endowment's appropriation. In this connection, the Endowment wishes to state that it would oppose any amendment of Public Law 89-209 which would fund the American Film Institute as a line item in the annual appropriation of the Endowment. Its view in this instance would reflect its objection in principle to line items which would break up the constituency of the arts into separate, competing elements.

(3) The Endowment plans to continue its programs in support of the art of film. These programs will include its allocations for independent filmmakers, and for film preservation, presently handled by contracts with the AFI. The Endowment feels that any duplication of its grant-making authority would be wasteful. For this reason it would question giving to the proposed film institute the grant making powers which are contained explicitly or implicitly in sections 103(a) (2) and (3) of the draft legislation.

In this connection we would add, as a general comment, that any organization expending public funds should not seek to carry on its extensive operations, and at the same time function as a grant-making agency for other institutions. For, experience suggests, in time of financial stringency, the pressure to maintain direct operations at the expense of funds assigned to others will be strong and may be irresistible; and the presence of this pressure, whether or not it is resisted, will be a source of friction between the institution and the constituency it is created to serve.

Thus it is the Endowment's view that the American Film Institute should continue to function as a national service institution for non-commercial film, and that the Endowment should continue in its present role as a grant-making agency in the same field. To the extent that this division of roles may appear to conflict with the original findings of the Stanford Research Institute, the Endowment would hold that eight years of experience suggests that the consolidation of these roles in a single Institute does not accord with the expressed desires of the constituency, or with the developing needs of our diversified culture.

	Fiscal years					
	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
National Endowment for the Arts	118,140	206,692	975,168	915,667	1,268,510	[1] 1,740,149
National Endowment for the Humanities					61,576	263,136
Ford Foundation	158,159	675,728	466,113	400,000	400,000	000,000
Motion Picture Association of America	217,000	524,805	558,195	155,000	83,500	0
Self-generated	978	7,718	93,313	238,259	233,470	151,080
Other	82,473	418,278	498,623	531,500	298,491	[2] 644,639
Grants, income		60,867	357,797	315,148	188,110	126,874

[1] Includes grants and contracts.
[2] Includes $547,383 received by John Ford Noonan, $125,000 contributed by Columbia Broadcasting System, $18,659 generated by the Film Day, $22,300 from American Broadcasting Co., and $17,100 from Academy of Motion Pictures.

Source: Figures quoted directly above are from the American Film Institute's financial statements as of the closing dates June 30, 1972 and June 30, 1973.

STATEMENT OF MISS NANCY HANKS, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS, ACCOMPANIED BY MICHAEL STRAIGHT, DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

Miss HANKS. Thank you very much.

Well, as usual, the National Endowment for the Arts is going to be a little too wordy. I will try to summarize as fast as I can—perhaps you are very familiar with the AFI—and Mr. Straight will pick me upon points I might miss in a fast summary.

Even in the short time available, we prepared some extensive testimony in order to give the members of the committee background of Government funding of the American Film Institute.

As long as you told me to be brief, Mr. Brademas, I believe I will begin at the end of the prepared testimony and work from that direction.

I believe that it is an understatement to say that it is the Endowment's view that the American Film Institute should continue to function as a national service institution for noncommercial film and that the Endowment should continue in its present role as a grant-making agency in the same field. To the extent that this division of roles may appear to differ with the original findings of the Stanford Research Institute, or President Johnson's statement, which you noted, the Endowment would suggest, as Chuck Heston already mentioned, that 5 years of experience just perhaps caused an evolution, and our belief is that the consideration of the roles in a single institute does not accord with the expressed desires of the constituency or with the developing needs of our diversified culture.

I think, to speak to Mr. Sarasin's point, which Mr. Schneider addressed and Mr. Quie commented upon, I belive the inherent conflict between funding organizations and the broad constituency is lessened if an operating agency is separated from a grant-making agency. This is the experience that has been found, for example, by the Smithsonian and other institutions.

You have in your testimony from the Arts Endowment figures supplied by the American Film Institute—it is the last page—in terms of the funding sources of income of the Institute since 1968. You will note there that the support provided by the Ford Foundation was terminated, that the support from the Film Industry has not

developed according to all of our potential hopes and, further, the support from the National Endowment for the Arts has exceeded expectations of the Government and the Institute and those projected in the Stanford report at the time.

The institute's funding situation began to cause some difficulties as far as our policies are concerned at the Endowment in fiscal 1972. As a result of discussions with the institute, the National Council on the Arts recommended at that time that a grant be made of $1 million to the institute and that the funds for filmmaking fellowships and film preservation, in which the committee has expressed strong interest, be made in terms of contracts from the Endowment rather than as part of the basic grant.

This relationship has continued since 1972. The difficulties experienced by the institute in generating increased support have indeed made it difficult for the institute to match on a one-to-one basis the grant sums provided by the Endowment. The National Council as a result, on a continuing basis, has recommended that the matching requirements of the Endowment be eased temporarily to meet the difficulties of the institute.

This modification, Mr. Chairman, you will recall, and the members of the committee will recall, was reviewed by the Select Subcommittee on Education and commented favorably upon. Naturally, the Endowment welcomed the statement of the Subcommittee and notes that the film preservation work, in which the committee has consistently expressed interest, is presently being handled by contract.

I would like to state, however, an emphasis for the information of the members of the committee, that the National Endowment for the Arts, within its present budget levels, does not have the funds that the entire profession believes to be important to save the film of this country. This is the view of members of the Library of Congress, the Museum of Modern Art, and the George Eastman House, which changed its name, and I have forgotten what it is. Anyway, those are the three large film preservation organizations in the country.

The Endowment has repeatedly stated, to go on, that it regards the matching provision contained in its law as indispensable to the successful operation of the Endowment. It regards the waiver of the matching provision in the case of grants as a necessary but temporary measure, as far as the American Film Institute is presently constituted.

I wish to note further that, while our legislation requires matching on a one-to-one basis, it is very rare we match on anywhere near a one-to-one basis. Our percentage support for most organizations is very small indeed.

In addition to supporting the American Film Institute, I wish to point out to the members that the Endowment has had its own program of support for media projects around the country, and that program is approximately $1 million including $1 million for special Bicentennial media projects this year, in fiscal 1975.

If I might, I will put those figures into context to indicate what one of the preceding—I believe it was Mr. Heston—people mentioned, and that is, we received in fiscal year 1974 322 applications for some $58 million, and many of these applications were of great merit and great validity. (In fiscal year 1974 funds totaling $2.4 million were granted, not including $1.75 million to AFI.

In order to put it again into context, our total ability in fiscal year 1975, within our funding levels, will be on the order of under $1 million for an expected $30 million in applications. Therefore, you can see the American Film Institute's position of their need for funds and, as Mr. Heston carefully and elegantly pointed out, that they cannot be in a position of competing with requests coming from all over the country, when the requests are this heavy. I think he made this point far better than I could have made it.

To repeat and to remind the committee, the public media grants program is basically in three areas: grants to the American Film Institute, not including the American Film Institute Theater; contracts to AFI; and the Endowment's own granting program that I have just mentioned.

We have been in discussion with the Film Institute over the last 4 to 5 years concerning its development, and we are in basic agreement on several points that are detailed in the testimony itself on pages 9 and 10. To evidence the concern of the National Council on the Arts, I might mention that we have had a special committee of the National Council working directly with the Film Institute for the past 3 to 4 years to give special attention to its needs.

In terms of questions raised by the organization and the funding arrangements of the Institute contained in the draft legislation, Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to defer to the views of the Civil Service Commission and Office of Management and Budget on these issues. The Endowment has no position at the present time on the composition of the proposed Board or the funding arrangements.

I would also note that the Endowment's views do not at this time necessarily represent the position of the Administration on the desirability of establishing direct Federal funding for the Institute.

I would like to highlight three continuing principles of the Endowment, if I might, Mr. Chairman. First—and Mr. Heston made this point—that all of the arts must be seen as a single constituency, and while the Congress may at some time choose to recognize that special circumstances surround the Film Institute, the Endowment and the Council wish to reaffirm their belief that filmmaking is an individual segment of the arts' constituency.

Second, we would like to state that we would oppose any amendment to our own law, which would fund the American Film Institute as a line item in the annual appropriation of the Endowment. Our view in this instance would reflect our objection, in principal, as Mr. Heston, who is a member of the council, so well stated, to any diminution of the policy role of the council and to any line items which would break up the constituency of the arts into separate competing elements.

Third, we will continue, of course, as we were urged to do by the Congress, in our own programs of support of film, and we would, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, question the advisability of giving the proposed film institute grant-making powers which are contained explicitly or implicitly in our view in some sections of the legislation.

In closing, I would merely like to thank the chairman for giving us this opportunity to participate in these discussions and reaffirm Mr. Heston's position that film is an important form. It is an

American art form, and the American Film Institute is fulfilling an important role and service to the art of film.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Miss Hanks, for a very helpful statement.

I have a number of questions I might put to you. One at the outset, I suppose, is a fairly fundamental question. On page 11 of your statement, you remark that the Endowment and the Council on the Arts are committed to the view that all of the arts must be seen as a single constituency.

I am familiar with that point of view. I confess I regard it as a somewhat metaphysical attitude toward life. The Arts Endowment, insofar as I know, does not run Hirshhorn or the National Gallery of Art or the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, not to speak of a wide variety of nonpublicly supported activities in the arts. Aside from the fact that I don't regard your statement as an accurate description of the real world in this country, on public policy grounds, I would have the most profound apprehension about any attitude that seemed to diminish the pluralistic support of the arts in American life.

I wonder if you could allay my fears and apprehensions?

Miss HANKS. My heavens, we have obviously misstated.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I think so.

Miss HANKS. I think so, and it must have been, of course, in the rush of drafting the statement, for which I apologize. As you know, sir, in testimony before this committee and in comments all over this country, one of the most important missions of the Endowment and the National Council on the Arts has been its belief in plurualism of support, pluralism from Government, all levels of pluralism from private foundations, private corporations, and certainly individuals.

The point on the constituency is merely that the council's concern, I believe it is the concern as stated in the legislation, when the arts are described in all of their phases as being of importance to the country—and the Congress has reviewed every 3 years the listing of what is called art in the legislation, and to the best of my knowledge, there was only one change in the listing. And that was to add the environmental arts as important to life—I believe they were added 2 or 3 years ago.

In the legislation are included films, radio, and television. In connection with the total of the three observations that we make; it is our only point that we would oppose any singling out of film activity for special line item funding within our legislation. We do not believe, in reading the legislation, that this is the intent of the chairman or the committee.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We may still be, Miss Hanks, talking at cross purposes here.

The only point I wanted to get across is this: I think it is not necessary to have a single arts administrative authority in the Government of the United States, in order to hold the view, to quote your statement that "all of the arts must be seen as a single constituency." I hope I am making my point clearly.

Obviously we are in agreement that we need a diversity of support, public and private, at all levels of government for the arts. I find it difficult, rationally, to appreciate the force of your language here, and

what I am trying to suggest is that, you are responding to my question by telling me of other art forms that could be supported by the National Endowment for the Arts which is really not related to the question that I am trying to raise.

In other words, I see nothing unreasonable about raising the question of whether it may not be proper for other authorities of the Federal Government—or other kinds of institutions within the American society, both public and private—to utilize public funds to support activities in the arts. That is all I am getting across.

Miss HANKS. Oh, then we were talking across each other, because you know how strongly I feel about perhaps support from the Office of Education in the arts field. Certainly we work on a very cooperative basis with the National Park Service and other areas of the Interior in cooperative funding, so I couldn't agree more that that funds from all areas of the Federal Government should go into the arts. That was not the point here.

Mr. BRADEMAS. So, I take that particularly in respect of the American Film Institute—which, as your testimony has indicated, was recognized in a unique way by President Johnson in 1965—you would not object to the proposition that a unique form of organizing administratively an institution for carrying film activities might be justified.

Miss HANKS. Yes, we would oppose grant-making functions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Then, I fear that I have to read into your statement—and I really don't want to do this, I am sure you will straighten me out if I am wrong—a kind of apprehension that only the National Endowment for the Arts is equipped to support grant-making activities in the arts at the Federal level. Is that what you are saying?

Miss HANKS. No, I wouldn't say that, sir. But I would say that it is confusing and could be confusing to the constituency, if you have, an American Film Institute making grants in film in the same areas as the National Endowment for the Arts funding.

Mr. BRADEMAS. But now do you not under your public media program get into some of the same kinds of activities, as I read your statement, that AFI supports?

Miss HANKS. We intend not to.

Mr. BRADEMAS. What is the difference between the activities, or are there overlaps between the public media program of the arts endowment and the programs of the AFI?

You are earmarking about $4 million for the public media program for fiscal 1975?

Miss HANKS. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, may we present for the record—and I hoped to have them here—apparently the Xeroxing machine is broken down—a definition?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Another good argument for diversity?

Miss HANKS. Well, no, it does not work—we have four Xerox machines and they all break.

Our moneys will be about $4 million. The reason I had wanted to have the figures for you, and I will within minutes, I hope, I wanted to show you the level of funding and so forth.

Our major program is called programing in the arts. These figures have arrived. In terms of television or basically for television, we

support—and this includes our cooperation with other sources of funds, never on a nonmatching basis—programs such as the film "Bolero," which won the Academy Award, the film, I hope you saw, on the American Ballet Theater, "Close-Up in Time," and we are continuing to support really fine programming in the arts on television.

We also have a substantial media program of film in cooperation with the 50 States, and they are in the process of submitting applications for funding of the cultural heritage in each of the 50 States. We will then pull those together, hopefully, and they will be used, not only within their States and regions, but there will be a national film made of them.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If you will let me interrupt, Miss Hanks, that is helpful, but what I am really trying to understand is simply the extent to which there may be any similarity of programming in the AFI and your program under the public media program?

Miss HANKS. Well, we have done our best to keep them separate and to work in cooperation. The staffs have worked and consulted on them. At the present time, I believe there is a little to no overlap or duplication.

This is our concern and why we wish to put in the record that we are very opposed to any duplication. What is not in the statement, but what I would say as forcefully as I possibly could, Mr. Chairman, is that no matter what decision is made by the committee or the Congress in terms of the American Film Institute, we plan to work in as close cooperation, if not more, in the future than we have in the past, because, as you make a very strong point, the art, any art is helped by a variety of sources, not only of support but leadership.

Mr. BRADEMAS. How long has the public media program been in existence?

Miss HANKS. The first year that moneys were given in the media were in 1967. The total funding at that time was $788,300. The moneys were reduced in the following years, and they started to climb again in 1972, when approximately $1 million was expended.

From 1972 up to 1975, the figures have gone up to approximately $4 million. That is not including the Film Institute. The Film Institute is about—if you add it all together—approximately one-third of our total programming.

Mr. BRADEMAS. So the Endowment has $4 million for the public media program, and approximately $1 million going to AFI. Here I address myself to fiscal 1975—does that $1 million come out of the $4 million?

Miss HANKS. No. It is approximately $1.1 million in grants, and it is about $680,000 in contracts.

Mr. BRADEMAS. And the figure in your statement, the $3.9 million—does that include grants, or is it grants only? On page 8, you say, "The public media program is currently administering $3.9 million in grants in fiscal 1975;" is that right?

Miss HANKS. In addition to the funds for the AFI——

Mr. BRADEMAS. Correct. So how much is AFI scheduled to receive this fiscal year?

Miss HANKS. $1.1 million.

Mr. BRADEMAS. $1.1 million. So the ratio to grants is something on the order of about 4 to 1, if my arithmetic is correct?

Miss HANKS. Yes. We consider the grants to the Film Institute, of course, in terms—I mean, the contracts to the Film Institute—of advancing the purposes of the Film Institute and the Endowment.

Mr. BRADEMAS. All right. I appreciate that.

As an old budget reader, I am just trying to understand that we are using the same English language. I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. I understand you were putting the question only on grants?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. Does that mean contracts?

Mr. BRADEMAS. No.

Mr. QUIE. Is there something else?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I believe that Miss Hanks was making a point that Arts Endowment money in two forms goes to AFI, one in the form of grants to the tune in fiscal 1975 of about $1.1 million and in the form of contract, something in the order of $700,000. In terms of grants from the NEA to the public media program, that is $3.9 million, and nothing was said of contracts in respect to the public media program.

Miss HANKS. In the $3.9 million—and I would have to check—but there are some contracts in there. But it is just for ease and facility of handling in that instance.

Mr. QUIE. Is it the same magnitude we talk of in AFI grants at $1.1 million and contracts of about $700,000?

Miss HANKS. $680,000, yes.

Mr. QUIE. Is it of the same magnitude in the public media program?

Miss HANKS. No; the public media program itself in total is $3,938,000.

Mr. QUIE. Yes; but does the same percentage go into contracts there?

Miss HANKS. No.

Mr. QUIE. A very small percentage?

Miss HANKS. A very small percentage into contracts.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Miss Hanks, you can give us those breakdowns for the record so we have an understanding. When will we hear from the administration on this legislation, Miss Hanks?

Miss HANKS. I don't know. Has the bill been submitted formally to them?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Well, it has been submitted to your office. I can think of no more formal submission than to you.

Miss HANKS. I didn't act by it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I know that the Office of Management and Budget does have a copy which they picked up by hand. Perhaps, that is, through the instrumentality of your appearance, you would be kind enough to ask them what their views are?

Mr. QUIE. Will you yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. Normally, committees officially ask the administration for their views and get answers in writing. Our committee does not generally do that, and I never did know why, but it is just one of the peculiarities of our committee.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The mail service is so bad.

I have other questions, but I want to yield to Mr. Quie.

[The document referred to above follows:]

Contracts awarded by public media program

Fiscal year 1974:	Amount
Glen Fleck	$20,000
Center for Understanding, Media, Inc	98,500
MIT	9,250
Total	127,750

This represents 3.06 percent of the public media program budget.

Fiscal year 1975 (to date):	Amount
Glen Fleck	$5,000
Allan Miller	5,000
Total	10,000

This represents 0.16 percent of the public media program budget.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me ask you on the public media program, what kind of matching is required there?

Miss HANKS. Minimum 50–50.

Mr. QUIE. So that means that of the $3,938,916 that went for grants or supposed to go for grants in 1975, we can expect another $3,938,916 from other sources?

Miss HANKS. Well, I cannot calculate this program easily, but if it runs true to most of the other programs at the Endowment, we will be bringing in $3 to $4 for every single dollar.

For example, for funding of the American Drama Series for Television, we have at least a three-to-one match.

Mr. QUIE. The information you provided at the end of your testimony indicates that a number of the non-Federal grants are going down. The Ford Foundation in 1969 was $675,728. It then dropped from 1971 to 1972 to a straight $400,000, and in 1973, it zeroed out.

You don't have 1974 in here. I imagine that didn't pick up again, judging from the Ford Foundation's problems that we read of in the press. That is still zeroed out. Is that correct?

Miss HANKS. Well, the Film Institute can provide you with the figures. It is my understanding the Ford Foundation will not again support the program. Their moneys were directed to the effort at Graystone. However, I would like to mention, and the figures from 1974 will be provided to the committee by the American Film Institute, it is my understanding in 1974—and I will give you comparative figures—private funding will be on the order of $1,189,000 in comparison to $796,000. Now, that is a substantial increase in private funding, which is to the joy of all of us, the American Film Institute having worked very hard to increase its private funding.

The estimate in connection with contributed goods and services increases from the figure you see before you of $126,874, to $229,502. So, therefore, you can see a growth pattern in terms of private support, in goods and services and funds, by the Film Institute. That is due in great measure to very hard work in increasing their moneys and the dedication of its board.

As a matter of fact, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Quie, when the National Council on the Arts has been working with the American Film Institute with a council committee over the years, when it saw the trend line going up in private moneys, when it had assurance that the financial problems—not problems, but potentials in this area were working themselves out from where they had been in 1972—they

requested that they go out of business and that there was no need any longer for a council committee.

Mr. QUIE. If AFI continued being funded by NEA, would you expect to get them to that same 50-50 relationship which other organizations have?

Miss HANKS. Well, it would depend assuredly on the American Film Institute. It is difficult to answer the question. It would appear from figures I have been given this morning that they will be well on their way, and Mr. Stevens might comment on it, on matching the $1.1 million on a 50-50 basis. But in terms of increased moneys for their operations, I simply cannot comment.

Mr. QUIE. Well, I was not talking about what they would finally do, but what the attitude of NEA or the Council itself would be. Would you continue to have the same relationship as in the past as far as AFI being funded from NEA, or would the Council try to push them to at least a 50-50 relationship? Would they expect to have pressure from the Council?

Miss HANKS. They would expect pressure from the Council on a 50-50 basis because it is in the legislation and the Council has viewed its relationship on less than a 50-50 basis with the AFI as temporary.

Mr. QUIE. You have also, in the last sheet, an item called "other," which keeps increasing. It took a small drop in 1972, but in 1973 was larger than ever before. You mentioned various items and in the AFI report, you talk about earned income. Would those two, or would earned income be a part of that?

Miss HANKS. I can't answer your question.

Mr. QUIE. You put a parenthesis after 61,000, and it does not add up.

Miss HANKS. It is all private income, Mr. Quie. The $644,696 figure comes from individual contributions of $85,000, corporate contributions of $151,000, the John Ford Television Show is $125,000, the John Ford dinner is $147,000, the Film Day is $18,869, the 1776 benefit is $24,000, the Tom Sawyer benefit is $1,500, the Theatre Opening benefit is $20,000, and foundation grants are $67,000, coming to a total of around $645,000.

That figure is the one I mentioned—the one I mentioned has increased rather encouragingly, and in the figure of 1974, it goes from $645,000 to $891,000, which is about a $250,000 increase.

Mr. QUIE. OK. Thank you.

The other question I have is, concerns you mentioning that grant-making authority ought to remain under the Endowment and that AFI would have a separate item and there should be allocation for independent filmmakers and film preservation, which is presently handled by contracts with AFI. When you deal with contracts with AFI, does AFI in turn then contract out with anyone else presently?

Miss HANKS. I don't know whether they are handled by contract or not. We are very pleased with the relationship with the American Film Institute on the contracts in the preservation area. A portion of their moneys go to the Library of Congress and a portion of the Museum of Modern Art, and a portion to George Eastman House in Rochester, and I don't know whether that is by grant or contracts, Mr. Quie.

In connection with the filmmaker fellowships, the fellowships are

awarded by the American Film Institute under guidelines prepared by the Film Institute. It is a subgranting situation in both instances.

Mr. QUIE. You speak, in your testimony, about section 103(a) (2) and (3). The first part of section 103(a)(2), permits the Institute to undertake and coordinate through contract or otherwise the preservation of films and film artifacts of artistic and historical value. I always considered that as one of AFI's primary responsibilities.

I am wondering, from the way you explained it, if they would have to do it all in-house? The way it is asked for in the first part of 103(a) (2) is that they would have authority to contract out. I don't see what is objectionable about them contracting out to do one of their main responsibilities.

Mr. STRAIGHT. In reference to that—just to the words, "or otherwise," which conceivably includes grants from the Institute to make films.

Mr. QUIE. You have no problems with contracts?

Mr. STRAIGHT. No, sir.

Mr. QUIE. OK. Then in section (3), or rather 103(a)(3), it reads, "Maintain and operate a conservatory for advance study * * *," and so forth, "to be made available to studies of other activities," et cetera.

I understand we are talking about Graystone here in the first part of that. Is that the only conservatory that is operated now?

Mr. STRAIGHT. My understanding it is in the context of Graystone, and, of course, it is a special situation, and my understanding from Mr. Stevens is that those grants would predominantly be made to Graystone fellows or young filmmakers just coming out of Graystone and can be established in the industry.

Of course, that is a particular situation which we would recognize and respect.

Mr. QUIE. You would find acceptable the Graystone relationship with AFI continuing with separate funding?

Mr. STRAIGHT. Yes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Sarasin.

Mr. SARASIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you.

I have two other questions. You will recall Mr. Heston's testimony, to quote his words,

> It is no longer feasible for AFI to carry out its mandate under the umbrella of the Council on the Arts,

and then again to quote him,

> It is necessary for us now to go our own way under the terms of the bill you are now considering. It was the Chairman of the National Council who first suggested we seek a separate identity, and of course, he was right.

Now, I take it you are in agreement with that observation, or are you not?

I just want to be sure our history is straight here. It was my understanding that, as we were discussing some kind of legislation that, without your being affixed to any particular language, you were indeed sympathetic to some kind of separate identity for the AFI?

Miss HANKS. Mr. Heston and I are always in agreement. I don't recall if I specifically recommended this particular legislation. I did not, as a matter of fact. It was drafted separately, but in cooperation—I mean, we saw it.

What happened was, really, Mr. Chairman, beginning in 1969 and 1970, we have been in constant communication and cooperation with the American Film Institute. We have explored many opportunities or alternatives in terms of keeping a vital institute in this country. This approach is one alternative among a variety of others. We have explored some of the others. They have not turned out to be acceptable. One other which you know of, I would assume, would be perhaps some association with the Smithsonian Institution, because it seemed to us in our early discussions, that there was a similarity there.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Yes. I agree with you in respect of this particular proposal. The point I was getting at is this: It was my own understanding you were sympathetic to the general thrust of the proposition there ought to be some separate identity for the AFI apart from the National Arts Endowment?

Miss HANKS. My feeling is that the American Film Institute has always had a separate identity from the National Endowment for the Arts. It was hoped in the very early years in statements by the American Film Institute itself, and by Roger Stevens when he set forth the theme, that the American Film Institute would have strong private moneys, and I still hope they will have strong private moneys.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The reason I raised these questions, aside from wanting to be accurate on my own understanding of the history of the discussions on these matters, touches in part, also, on your comment on page 9 of your statement. You suggest—if I read the statement right—that your plans, were the legislation under consideration not to become law, would contemplate that the budget and activities of the American Film Institute be turned over to the public medial panel of the National Arts Endowment, in accordance with practices followed by all other programs in the endowment. I was quite startled. In fact, I was astonished, to be candid about it, and I like to be candid.

Miss HANKS. You are.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I was really astonished by that statement because it indicated to me that there perhaps is not sufficient awareness in the endowment that the AFI is not like all other programs of the endowment, but indeed, is a response to the Presidential statement that you and I cited at the outset of the hearings and was intended to be a unique kind of enterprise. I have been involved in this legislation, too, for some time as you know, both during your distinguished chairmanship and that of your predecessor.

I hope that we are not in a situation where the AFI is thought of as another program, which, like the Metropolitan Opera or a wide variety of programs or projects that might be cited, is another recipient of a grant from the arts endowment without that kind of unique characterization which I think most of us in Congress and certainly Presidents have thought it should have.

Am I making my point clearly? And, if I am mistaken in my understanding of either history or your point of view, I would certainly stand ready to be corrected.

Miss HANKS. It is unique in many ways. The reason we had a council committee to work with it over a long period of time is because it is unique in its accomplishments. It is also unique in the fact that, in terms of funding, it has not worked out as everybody who began it thought it would. That is also its uniqueness; that is why we gave it its special place.

But the Council on the Arts feels very strongly that the American Film Institute is part and parcel of the development of film as an art in this country. And it feels very strongly that discussions concerning the endowment's relationship with the Film Institute, in terms of the total endowment involvement in public media, should be part of its own advisory panel in public media.

It views it this way very positively in terms of the strength of the American Film Institute and the American Film Institute's relations to other programs. I believe I would not misstate this fact to say that the Chairman of Public Media Panel, Mr. Richard Leacock, agrees with this position; is that correct, Michael?

Mr. STRAIGHT. Yes.

Miss HANKS. And Mr. Leacock was formerly a member of the American Film Institute Board. I have not personally, Mr. Chairman, discussed the question with Mr. Heston of the council committee's strong recommendations to the council that it abolish itself. We have not seen each other since the council took that action in May.

We set up, Mr. Chairman, special council committees to handle rough situations, and when they seem to be straightening out and the strengthening goes on, they are then returned to the situation where they were before, and I think that this is an important positive step being taken by the council. As I mentioned earlier in my testimony, this is happening in greater measure because of the remarkable achievement of the board of the American Film Institute and the staff of the American Film Institute to increase private support and earned income.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Well, I appreciate that. I am not surprised that the people in the Film Committee, as I understand your statement, should recommend that the media panel of the NEA supervise the budget and activities of AFI.

In like fashion, I should not be surprised if the board of trustees of AFI should recommend that the board of trustees of AFI should supervise the activities of the endowment.

Miss HANKS. I perhaps misspoke, sir. I think I did not make my point at all. It is the National Council on the Arts that recommends that the AFI be considered by the public media panel. I did not say the public media panel requested any such action.

Mr. BRADEMAS. My point still stands and I honestly had not contemplated that in order to avoid duplication of effort it might be sensible for the public media program henceforth to be operated under the rubric of the AFI. That is another administrative alternative that I suppose could be contemplated. I myself would prefer that we could work out some arrangement that would take into account at least two facts: One, the overwhelming larger degree of public participation in watching film as distinguished from most other art forms, and, second, the historically unique character assigned to the AFI.

I am not sure, in light of the testimony today, we are on all fours on that. But I remain hopeful, as an old negotiator, that we can work something out which will win the warm-spirited cooperation of the National Council and of the American Film Institute, and, most importantly of all, will be effective in generating greater support for quality film and the art of film in the United States, which I am sure is our common objective.

Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. Could I ask a question that is apropos of that? You notice we placed the Arts Endowment Chairman and the Humanities Endowment Chairman on the AFI Board. Perhaps we ought to put the Chairman of AFI on the board of the other two so there would be a realization of what the other one is doing in order to get both sides represented.

Now, the question I would want to ask is this:

Miss HANKS. Mr. Quie, on which board would you place the Chairman of the American Film Institute? On which board?

Mr. QUIE. On both of the other two boards.

Miss HANKS. On the public media film panel?

Mr. QUIE. On the National Council on the Arts, and the Humanities Council.

Miss HANKS. We have very strong representation from film. Mr. Heston was a member.

Mr. QUIE. I realize that.

Miss HANKS. We have no other representation by a single organization on the National Council on the Arts.

Mr. QUIE. I recognize you don't now, but we are going to have a two-way street. I think it is something our committee ought to consider and I would not want you to answer that now, but think about it.

Miss HANKS. OK.

Mr. QUIE. Second, I want to ask you, to what extent do you fund other conservatories?

You can provide that information for the record as well.

Miss HANKS. Yes.

[Document follows:]

Conservatories funded by the National Endowment for the Arts, fiscal year 1974

Professional theater training program fiscal year 1974

Art Institute of Chicago (Goodman)	$7,000
Boston University	8,000
Brandeis University	5,000
Carnegie-Mellon University	15,000
Juilliard	8,250
New York University	12,500
Ohio University	15,000
Southern Methodist University	7,250
Temple University	7,425
University of Washington	15,000
Yale University	15,000
Total	115,425

Basically, the amounts that have been arrived at by the Panel and Council for the schools (Federal money only) are as follows:

Music training program fiscal year 1974:

Cleveland	$40,000
Juilliard	55,000
Manhattan	40,000
Mannes	30,000
New England	45,000
New School	30,000
Peabody	40,000
Philadelphia	30,000
San Francisco	40,000
Total	350,000

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would just make one other final observation which occurs to me. As we look at the amount of money that is presently being put into the public media programs—and we earlier talked about grant authority, something in the neighborhood of $8 million in grants and $4.5 million in grants for AFI—I am apprehensive that these kinds of relationships may have the effect of discouraging filmmakers and others who are interested in supporting film from coming up with adequate private money for the AFI program because they see a larger pot of money over in the public media program.

I don't know the answer to that question. I only raise that as a concern. Would you like to comment on that, Miss Hanks?

Miss HANKS. Well, the moneys going to the American Film Institute are about half of the total moneys going to other films areas in the country. We have arguments on both sides of the balance in terms of that funding. In the view of the National Council of the Arts, given the present total funding levels of the Endowment, this balance, which they have reviewed about twice a year, is the right one.

I don't think it stops money coming in from any source. As I mentioned to you earlier, we do have the difficulty, sir, as a funding agency in that we receive $50 million worth of requests for basically the whole program.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Well, thank you very much indeed, Miss Hanks and Mr. Straight. This has been very helpful and I hope we shall have an opportunity to invite you back further as we continue to try to work out this legislation.

I beg your pardon. I see Mr. Lehman has since returned and I want to yield to him for such questions he may have.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield back the rest of my time.

Miss HANKS. We will be very happy and we thank you very much and may we submit the figures for the record on this?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Of course.

Miss HANKS. I think that will put in in context. Thank you very much and we are very grateful that you would have these hearings. I hope that as a result of the hearings, the primary thing will be the strengthening of the importance of the American Film Institute and the importance of film in this country.

I think we are all in agreement on that. I must say that we would only wish that there were enough moneys so that we could particularly add funds for the programing of the live arts on film and television because that is one of the only ways we will be able to reach every nook and cranny of this country.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

We will now hear from George Stevens, director of the American Film Institute, and I should point out there may be a quorum call at any time, but I am willing to remain.

Mr. Stevens, you have a lengthy statement and if you can summarize it, it would be appreciated. I don't want to cut you off and we can also have you come back tomorrow, but there are a couple of other witnesses scheduled then as well. I hope you will feel free also, as I am sure you will, to make any comments on any of the matters raised in questions of the earlier witnesses.

42-830—74——4

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I read Mr. Stevens' statement and maybe the other members have. Perhaps we can get right into the questions, if that is all right.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Maybe you would like to.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE STEVENS, JR., DIRECTOR, THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, I was going to skip directly to some of the points that have been raised. I would, if time allows—perhaps tomorrow, Mr. Chairman—make some of the points for the record since this is a survey of how the American Film Institute works, and of our accomplishments. It is clear the committee does not need a restatement of rhetoric because the members obviously already understand and appreciate, judging by Mr. Lehman's comments and those of other members of the committee, the importance of the widest distribution of film in this country.

I would go directly to the fact that Miss Hanks and the American Film Institute both recognize that we have a problem and, as Miss Hanks set forth, she has worked with us in an effort to find the solution. We have not landed on one that could be resolved through the normal workings of the endowment; and it was sometime last year when Miss Hanks suggested we might explore the possibility of moving over under the Smithsonian. We had a meeting, Miss Hanks and the Smithsonian people, informally to explore it; it proved it was not to be the solution.

I think it is important to state that we do not intend to take over the works of the public media panel. We recognize its functions as they have evolved and that they give grants to instititions in the country. I must say as the testimony develops and we talk about the change whereby the American Film Institute will go to the public media panel for its funding, we do see a potential hazard there, similar to the one which was described in Miss Hanks' testimony regarding us, that if an agency is both operating and granting, there can be conflicts.

If we go to the public media panel, the conflict could arise that whatever money they don't give us in a lump sum grant, they will have opportunity to deal directly on their own, so our suggestion in terms of the granting powers of the American Film Institute, are as follows:

We think it is necessary for us to have the authority to give certain grants. We feel that these should be approved in the budget, as approved by the Congress and the OMB, and that those funds are marked and understood to be grants to other institutions or to filmmakers.

So far, and I see no other need for us to make subgrants. AFI's subgranting has been in the area of the Archives program and independant filmmakers' programs both of which AFI originated. It is important for us to be able to give grants to stimulate work in the film arts. I see no conflict within our programs in continuing to do that because it is part of the coordinated effort among the conservatory at Greystone and the program of internships.

In existing cases, as it has now evolved, we originated this program and the Endowment has since supported it as a contract project with

AFI. We have a set amount of money to give in grants to independent filmmakers. We bring in panels of talented professional people who review the work of the applicants and make selections.

Tomorrow you will hear from one of the brightest proteges of that program, John Hancock, who got his start making films on a grant from the American Film Institute.

So we are presently making these subgrants and it appears to be working out, and we would like to think that the same principle could apply. We would be happy to be very specific and not seek a general mandate to be giving grants.

One other point that I would like to make in some detail is our reasons for choosing to seek this dependable form of existence. The idea of a national film institute has been tested and proven; but organizationally we do not seem to fit into any existing Federal agency. Under the design we have here, we will be able to keep the energy and commitment of our private sector trustees and still benefit from the continuity afforded by Government support.

Mr. Sarasin was quite interested in that structure and I think your questions are important, Mr. Sarasin. They are points that we have given substantial thought to. If I could address myself to that, there are really three issues:

One is, there is always the specter of censorship. Sometimes the appearance of evil can be evil. It is my judgment that this legislation makes a very good balance in that regard. There is a measure of accountability, the most important aspect of which is our requirement each year to report on our expenditures and justify the funds for next year.

And there is a question of money. The private sector trustees are indispensable because of their ability to bring the private revenues to the film institute. We have found, or I have observed, that in bodies where people are appointed, they sometimes accept the position as an honor and are not prepared to do the work. We have a very careful recruitment process in which we ask people when they come on our board—and we have been doing this to an increasing degree relative to the increasing success we have had in private fundraising—for their commitment that they will be active in generating money for the film institute.

We are anxious to keep that dedicated and committed chain of people working for the American Film Institute. It is my view that this can be well harmonized.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to respond to questions if you want to direct any questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Stevens.

Mr. Stevens, I take it you think that giving the AFI independent statutory authority would make it easier to raise money for AFI. Will you comment on that?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes. I think for one thing it would provide the stable and assured segment of Government funding, which we presently cannot depend on. And I think our programing and our general life would be improved by the confidence of the staff, the confidence of the trustees, that this is no longer just an experiment whose duration might be in doubt, but that it is part of the general fabric of American cultural life.

Mr. BRADEMAS. You say,

As to our funding, we are not proposing a great change. We presently get nearly $2 million annually in Government funds and the present ratio of Government to private money fits in with the ratio of this bill, that is, two-thirds public and one-third private.

Can you comment on how you see the future funding pattern for the AFI?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes. Mostly we seek stability. Second, we seek moderate growth in funding. Our Government funding has been static with a minor variation for the past 3 years and you can imagine the effect of having a static amount of Government sector funding during these particular past 3 years.

To go directly to your point, Mr. Chairman, we have prepared a kind of budget. Had we been authorized and budgeted in this fiscal year, we would have seen our $2 million segment of Government funding and we would have asked for approximately $350,000 as an increase, and we would project an increase of a similar size going into the fiscal year 1976.

So, in terms of dollars, I think it is a figure that we can agree is modest, but the very important part of it is the assured existence and the stability.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Just one other question, Mr. Stevens. Miss Hanks expressed her concern about grant-making authority being given to the AFI. In your statement you indicate that you don't see a great deal of conflict between the public media program of the Endowment and indeed that you assume that the Public Media Panel's grant-making authority to institutions should be continued to be in the hands of that organization.

Wherein do you see a distinction between the kind of grant-making authority you think you ought to have and the public media program of the Endowment?

Mr. STEVENS. Only in the two particular grant-making programs that we have underway now; one is the very important grants to independent filmmakers and the other is the continuance of the archival preservation activity.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I think you said that earlier, but I wanted to be sure I had it clear in my mind.

Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. Yes; thank you, Mr. Chairman.

What would your reaction be if, in the committee or on the floor, someone offered an amendment that was carried and matching would be 50-50 instead of two-thirds Federal and one-third private? That is always a possibility.

Mr. STEVENS. I think we would be right back where we started. I think when we say the American Film Institute is unique in terms of the Endowment program, it is unique because it is a national operating organization with requirements for staff and requirements for service across the country. The 50–50 matching works very well for an individual symphony orchestra or ballet program or other kinds of local organizations which can take this supplementary money as a grant from the Endowment and use their revenues and ticket sales to match it.

Here we are talking about an organization which was originated by the Endowment and which, in the Stanford research report, to

which I referred in my testimony, recognized the importance of a large segment of public funding.

Mr. QUIE. In your conservatory how much of the total cost comes from students who attend it on non-Federal money as compared to Federal money?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Quie, we don't presently break down the budget and divide the Federal dollars versus private dollars by program. The amount of tuition to the Center is $50,000 in this coming year, which is an increase over the past year.

Mr. QUIE. The tuition is $50,000, but do you provide grants as well to the students to pay for a portion of that $50,000?

Mr. STEVENS. We defer tuition in some cases. This deferred tuition amounting to $130,000 this year will be payable to AFI in later years. We only have three scholarships.

Mr. QUIE. If the 50-50 matching requirement was made on your grants similar to what is now placed on the Endowment, and also on a conservatory, would you then be able to function all right?

Mr. STEVENS. If you were to categorize the conservatory as a project, which would be half-supported?

Mr. QUIE. Not more than half of it could be supported by Federal funds, I mean.

Mr. STEVENS. I would have to calculate it. At the present size of our budget, it would be quite close.

Mr. QUIE. Could you do that for us?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes. I think it might result in an unnecessarily complicated accounting and bookkeeping situation which we already suffer from because of the categorization of certain endowment matchings. For instance, the endowment does not allow the revenues from our theater here at the Kennedy Center to be counted as matching. That is over $150,000 a year.

So when you start to divide these things by program, I think it can become cumbersome, particularly as regards legislation and the fact that the trustees' hands would be tied.

Mr. QUIE. I wish you would give us as much information as possible on that because I would expect we will run into that proposal someplace along the line.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Sarasin.

Mr. SARASIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think that many of my earlier questions have been answered and I would like to thank Mr. Stevens for addressing himself to the questions I raised concerning the makeup of the Board.

I had several other questions, Mr. Chairman, but I don't consider them all that important. They are matters of personal interest and I would like to make that quorum call, so I yield back my time.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Stevens, there has been some criticism of the AFI on the ground you have not done an effective job in supporting independent filmmakers. My friends in New York are often distressed. I can cite a couple of them whom I saw yesterday.

What do you say to that charge?

Mr. STEVENS. I would say I think our program is very effective within the limitations of the amount of money available. We have

$200,000 a year to give out to new filmmakers and there will be many more who are disappointed by not receiving the grants than there will be who do receive them. We have regularly had a number of filmmakers from New York on the panel who make the selections. We have also had people who are representatives of other parts of the country on those panels and I think the careful examination of the program, the quality of the selection, the quality of the results, would uphold it.

We would like to have in future times more money for that activity. I think it deserves it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will just ask you two other quick questions before we call on our final two witnesses. First, however, I would ask you, Mr. Stevens, if it is possible for you to return tomorrow because some of the other members of the subcommittee may have questions for you?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Another point of criticism has to do with the controversy surrounding the dean of the Center for Advanced Film Training in California. Could you give us your comment on that dispute?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, Frank Danielle, who came from Czechoslovakia and was the dean of the center, had asked for much broader authority. He had asked for control over all banking, auditing, and budgeting. He asked for complete control over personnel and the staff and control over publicity, public relations facilities.

It was the judgment of the AFI Board when Mr. Danielle submitted his resignation, conditioned to return only if he were granted that authority, that the functions he was asking for were not those for which he was best equipped; and that they were powers that the Board did not want to delegate to him.

We all regretted losing a person who was a very fine teacher and who made a substantial contribution to the growth and the widely accepted effectiveness of that school, but his demands could not be met.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will put this question to you now, but I think it would be helpful, because it is rather specific, for some of the other members to hear it tomorrow, but I will be interested in knowing how AFI more specifically plans to spend whatever amounts of money you think are reasonable to anticipate?

I here refer to both expansion of existing AFI-supported programs and any new fields you may have in mind.

I thank you very much, Mr. Stevens. We appreciate your testimony and we look forward to questioning you again tomorrow.

[Statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GEORGE STEVENS, JR., DIRECTOR, THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is George Stevens, Jr. I am presently Director of The American Film Institute. My experience and background are as a director, producer, and executive in the field of motion pictures and television.

We are here to determine the future of The American Film Institute. I am pleased to be speaking on this subject to the representatives of the people because film, whether it is seen in a theater, on television, or in a classroom, is part of the everyday lives of the American people whom you represent. Film extends to every village and hamlet of this country—it is the most pervasive and influential of all the arts. We are here to make certain that The American Film Institute, which has come to life and proven itself during the past seven years, is assured permanent life as an institution in our society.

In the course of these hearings, we are prepared to provide complete information on the record of The American Film Institute and to demonstrate the genuine national need for the continuity and assured existence of this organization. The eminent historian, Daniel Boorstin, in his book *The Americans: The Democratic Experience* described the movies as "an American invention which, more than any other before, focused the version of the world. Motion pictures became the great democratic art which, naturally enough, was the characteristic American art."

We believe that this characteristic American art calls for a national film institute, and we believe the legislation before you is an excellent formulation for that institution. To help you with your deliberations, I will describe for you the history of The American Film Institute to date, reasons for the proposed new structure, and programs which the Institute proposes to carry out under this legislation.

I. THE HISTORY

For many decades, other countries have supported national film institutes, and it was therefore heartening when Lyndon Johnson, in signing the Arts and Humanities Act in 1965, stated:

"We will create an American Film Institute, bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators, and young men and women who wish to pursue the Twentieth Century art form as their life's work."

The American Film Institute was actually created in June of 1967 by the National Endowment for the Arts following a two-year study commissioned by the National Council on the Arts in which the Stanford Research Institute was directed to develop plans for the establishment of an American film institute. SRI visited more than 25 foreign film institutions and nearly 100 organizations in the United States. On December 15, 1966, the National Council heard a report which concluded that the American film institute should ". . . have divisions which will implement programs for an advanced study center for film education, archives, information services, planning and research."

On June 5, 1967, the National Endowment for the Arts announced the establishment of The American Film Institute and noted that AFI would derive its resources from both public and private funds. The Stanford Report noted: ". . . financial support of the scale estimated can probably come only from the broad base of the general public, by one avenue or another." The report observed that "In an overall perspective, this is probably appropriate, because of the extent to which film has become widely prevalent and commonplace in modern society. If national cultural development is to have any meaning in the public interest, the people who are exposed to, or enjoy, film as a modern art form should be entitled to receive the optimum benefit, however this may be defined. It is not improper, therefore, that the cost of a national film institute should ultimately be shared, somehow, by the public.

The Stanford Report concluded: "The most apparent pressing need is for stable, regular sources of permanent financial support of sufficient magnitude to enable the American Film Institute to become and maintain itself as the central inspiring force working toward greater excellence in film art in America."

This report was presented to the new AFI Trustees who were appointed by the Endowment and provided a $1,300,000 matching grant from the Endowment to get The American Film Institute under way.

I cite the Stanford Report in such detail because it is the absence of that "stable . . . financial support" which brings us together today.

Despite its uncertain funding and its share of attendant crises which are, it seems, part and parcel of cultural life these days, the Institute has survived and it has generated a range of programming accomplishments which, dollar-for-dollar, makes its investment of cultural funds one of the most outstanding on the American scene.

In 1966, The Stanford Report gave us the staggering fact that over half of the films created in the United States of America had been lost or were in danger of decay.

Today, as a result of AFI's collaborative archive program with the Library of Congress, the Museum of Modern Art, George Eastman House, and other institutions, there are 12,500 films preserved in the AFI collection in the Library of Congress. These films are part of our cultural heritage and our national memory, and we can now be sure that they will exist forever.

In 1967, there was virtually no activity under way to research and create a record of film history.

Today, The American Film Institute has an oral history program, supported by the L. B. Mayer Foundation, and, our most substantial accomplishment in a field with virtually limitless requirements, the ongoing project to produce The American Film Institute Catalog of Feature Films in collaboration with the National Endowment for the Humanities. When complete, this will be an unmatched and essential record for scholars, historians, and journalists of the cultural legacy of the visual media.

In 1967, There were nearly 100 universities teaching film. Today there are nearly 700, and there was a need for an advanced conservatory as described in the Stanford Report to serve as a bridge from the university to professional work.

Today, that conservatory exists and is recognized as one of the leading, if not the leading, film and television academy in the entire world. This is a major project of the Institute, and I would like the Committee to know more about it. I can tell you it was greeted, as so many new ideas are, with skepticism from many quarters. The academic community feared that it would be too commercial, and the professional community feared it would be too academic. We have not only achieved the best of both worlds—we have brought them together. We have an academy which has become both an example of the best methods of film education and which has produced graduates who have established themselves with artistic and professional achievements.

The Center for Advanced Film Studies depends upon two elements: We must attract the most promising and talented aspirants from every part of the country, and we must attract the most accomplished professional artists and craftsmen to inform them. Through seminars and workshops with the Screen Actors Guild, The American Society of Cinematographers, and Writers Guild of America, we have created a unique relationship with the professional community. The names of the people who have been to our conservatory in California to lecture and tutor is an anthology of the great people of the cinema arts. In the interest of time, I would ask the Chairman if I might insert for the record a list of the people who have donated their time and their knowledge at our conservatory for the benefit of our students.

The ultimate test of an institution such as ours is the accomplishments of its graduates. I will cite four examples. There are many others.

Thomas Rickman of Paducah, Kentucky, came to AFI with a great deal to say about American life and very limited experience as a screenwriter. Since leaving AFI, he has written professional screenplays, including The Laughing Policeman, starring Walter Matthau, and a new film soon to be released, W. C. Handy and the Dixie Dance Kings.

Oscar Williams came to us from the streets of New York City by way of San Francisco. Last year he wrote and directed the warm and popular family comedy Fire On The Black Hand Side.

Matthew Robbins came to us from Johns Hopkins University by way of the University of Southern California. This year he received the prize for screenwriting at the Cannes Film Festival for The Sugarland Express. He is presently writing the screenplay for MacArthur.

Terrence Malick, a Rhodes Scholar from Bartlesville, Oklahoma, and Harvard University, this year wrote, produced, and directed what is regarded by many critics as the most outstanding American film of the year, Badlands. Last week it was awarded the grand prize as best picture at the San Sebastian International Film Festival in Spain.

Two programs conducted at the conservatory are original to AFI and relate to the thrust of training new artists. We have given 130 grants to independent film artists across the country. These grants enable experimental film artists and other promising talents to advance their careers. You will hear more about this essential program tomorrow from one of its proteges, John Hancock, the director of the highly regarded film Bang The Drum Slowly, and from Ed Emshwiller, an experimental filmmaker and AFI Trustee who has taken an active role in this program.

An innovation of the Institute, partly funded by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, is a program of internships whereby talented young people from our conservatory, and elsewhere, are assigned to a leading filmmaker to observe first-hand the making of a film. This is an absolutely unique opportunity and it is made possible by AFI's constructive relationship with the professional community. Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert for the record, both as evidence for these hearings and as a small gesture of appreciation to the artists who help our interns, the names of the filmmakers who have contributed their time and talent to this program.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer for the record a list of 21 prizes and awards which have been won by AFI students and grantees. They illustrate the recognition and respect that AFI's filmmakers are earning.

There are other programs of worth which, in the interest of time, I will mention but not describe: the AFI Theater in the Kennedy Center—an example to the rest of the country of repertory programming of the best in world cinema; a series of scholarly and informative publications and periodicals, including "Dialogue on Film"; a national membership program which involves citizens across the country in AFI's work; a new project funded by the Rockefeller Foundation which is providing training and opportunity to women film directors; National Film Day—our fundraising effort with the film industry; and our annual Life-time Achievement Award which gives recognition to great American film artists and, last year, provided Institute programs with nearly $300,000 net revenue.

That is our record, Mr. Chairman. It is not meant to suggest that we have not had our share of mistakes and misjudgments, or that we have not found our share of detractors who think we should be doing different things or better things. I know I speak for the Trustees of The American Film Institute in saying that we have done our best and that we feel strongly that the American Film Institute now deserves official standing and government recognition which can only come from you—as expressed by the blend of support, independence, and accountability which is represented in the legislation before you.

II. REASONS FOR CHANGE

We are here to discuss legislation calling for a change. Clearly, this Committee must be interested in the reasons for the change.

The American Film Institute is an unusual beast, indeed a unique one. It was initiated at the direction of a United States President. It was created as an independent non profit organization by a new agency, the National Endowment for the Arts, and it received initial and primary funding from that agency. Its charter was based on a research study which called for an annual budget substantially larger than we have ever been able to achieve. Nevertheless, AFI has become the single largest annual recipient of a National Endowment grant.

Nancy Hanks, the able Chairman of the Endowment, recognizes AFI's problem and her own. Even though AFI is by far her largest grantee and a strain on her budget, the AFI is still woefully underfunded—a problem for both institutions.

Miss Hanks has been extremely cooperative in the search for a viable means by which The American Film Institute can exist and serve its public function. In fact it was Miss Hanks who first suggested that we jointly explore whether there were not other government auspices under which AFI could receive its funding, auspices which would solve the problems and overcome the limitations which exist for both NEA and AFI in the present relationship. In seeking alternate auspices, Miss Hanks and I first met informally with officials from the Smithsonian Institution, and it was discovered in time that a Smithsonian relationship was not the solution. A continued effort has taken a year's time, during which discussions were held with heads of various agencies and with members of the Congress, and during which full discussions of the alternatives were held among the AFI Board of Trustees.

The American Film Institute is, by its very nature, different from the vast majority of other grantees and projects of the National Endowment. First of all, The American Film Institute is a national organization with responsibility to carry out specific programs and provide services in different parts of the country for a single art form. This requires staff resources. Therefore, AFI needs general operating support, a category of funding which the National Endowment is least inclined to offer, and AFI needs a level of funding which is greater than that of organizations with strictly local functions.

NEA's matching provisions work against a national operating organization. Even though The American Film Institute generates large amounts of money, some $10,000,000 over the last seven years, it cannot match on a dollar for-dollar basis in the same fashion as a local project such as a symphony orchestra, a ballet company, or an opera group, which uses Endowment grants for special programs to supplement revenue from ticket sales.

This Committee gave attention to the special problem of matching as it applies to AFI and comments on it in its authorization report No. 93-255 dated June 5, 1973 as follows:

"Because it is a recipient of substantial grants from the National Endowment for the Arts, the Committee gave particular attention to the funding relationships between the American Film Institute and the Endowment. Specifically, we noted that AFI receives somewhat more than 50 percent of its

total budget from the National Endowment for the Arts while most other Endowment grantees are limited to a dollar-for-dollar ratio between its private and Federal funds.

"Because the AFI is a creation of the Endowment, rather than, as with other grantees, a private entity seeking Federal funds, the Committee believes the AFI should continue to have this funding relationship with the Endowment.

"In this regard, the Committee would stress that the authorizing language for the National Endowment for the Arts permits the Endowment to waive the matching requirements which accompany Endowment contributions.

"We believe the AFI should continue to expand its private fundraising sources, but we recognize that many of its programs, such as those in film and television archives development, will require primary funding by the Endowment. For such reasons, the Committee urges the Endowment to waive the matching requirements when necessary, in connection with the American Film Institute."

This action was instrumental in saving the life of the Institute at the time of its most severe financial crisis two years ago.

However, since then the Endowment has chosen not to increase AFI's grant and to hew back towards the fifty-fifty matching basis. We regret this, although we are also aware of the large and various demands on the Endowment from arts groups throughout the country. But the result has been that AFI's growth and even its ability to perform its present responsibilities have been threatened. AFI's total budget in fiscal year 1970 was $2,382,000 and in fiscal year 1974 it was $2,987,000. A young organization cannot survive with a static budget in normal times, and in these years of inflation we have faced forced cutbacks and cancellation of planned programs.

We must therefore find a way to sustain The American Film Institute as a national organization to serve a field and an art form which reaches more people than the other performing arts combined.

The legislation before us for creating AFI as a non-profit organization eligible to receive direct funding from the government seems to be the best solution to these problems. There are several reasons:

1. The idea of a national film institute has been tested and proven.

2. Organizationally, The American Film Institute does not fit into any existing federal agency.

3. As a non-governmental, non-profit organization with a segment of private sector trustees, AFI will retain its very heavy commitment for fund-raising and for talent and skills.

4. Accountability will be maintained because AFI will receive its government funds at the discretion of Congress and the Administration because its Board will include a number of trustees from the government and because it will be subject to audits by the General Accounting Office.

These factors allow the government the necessary oversight and control of the purse, and they also allow the Institute the necesary autonomy and private character to retain private sector interest in its programs and credibility among the creative, professional, and educational communities.

There are two objections which might be raised, and I think these should be confronted directly.

The first may come from entities which receive grants from the public media program of the National Endowment for the Arts. These organizations might fear that the Endowment would discontinue its activities in film or that the AFI would attempt to assume them. I know that the Endowment has no intention of abandoning them, and I think it important to state for the record that The American Film Institute does not seek the grant-making functions which the Endowment presently carries out. Take the example of the regional film study centers which the Endowment supports with grants. This type of grant-making must come from the Endowment. AFI's function is to provide technical assistance, programming assistance, and advice to these regional groups, and we will be prepared to do so to an even greater extent as we grow stronger in the future. The American Film Institute programs and those of the Public Media Panel of the Endowment presently complement each other. We foresee this continuing even more effectively and without conflict under the proposed legislation.

The second criticism might be that the action taken here for The American Film Institute would represent a pattern wherein other arts programs would be separated from the National Endowment. This is simply not the case, for there is no single activity within the National Endowment which is remotely comparable to The American Film Institute. The Institute deals with an entire

range of one art. It represents a distinctly American art with a particular set of problems and needs which require a national institute. The remote and unrealistic fear that other organizations might seek to follow this pattern can be discouraged in the record of these hearings which will stress AFI's uniqueness.

I think it is fair to say that Nancy Hanks' suggestion that AFI seek another home came from the fact that the Institute was not only the Endowment's largest grantee but that it was receiving funds for general operating expenses—something the NEA does not ordinarily provide, as a matter of policy—and that a substantial part of those funds were going to training artists, which NEA has resisted in other fields. Because of AFI's unique character, neither Miss Hanks nor I were concerned that this change in AFI's status would set a precedent for other spin-offs in other arts.

III. PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

Section 163 of this bill, *Powers and Duties of the Board*, describes ten areas of activity. Let me tell you what The American Film Institute will do with respect to each of these ten enumerated powers.

"(1) provide for the publication of historical records and of commentaries on the art of film, and disseminate such materials;"

This work presently encompasses The American Film Institute's

Catalog of Feature Films: 1921–1930.

Dialogue on Film—transcripts of seminars with leading artists at the conservatory which is published ten times a year when funding allows. Last year we were limited to eight issues.

The American Film Institute Guide to College Courses in Film and Television which informs students across the country what courses are available in our universities.

AFI News, an information bulletin for our members.

AFI Report, a distinguished quarterly which the Institute published for two years and which had to be suspended for financial reasons at the end of the last fiscal year. This highly regarded journal is among the first of our curtailed projects which we hope to resume when funding becomes available.

We are publishing two books through Little Brown & Company based on the artistic knowledge obtained from the seminars at the Center for Advanced Film Studies. These and other books designed to enlarge understanding of the film and television media will be carried out under this section.

"(2) undertake and coordinate, through contract or otherwise, the preservation of films and film artifacts of artistic and historical value (including films and recordings made for television), and the production of films for charitable, patriotic, educational, or other public purposes;"

I have described the archival program under which classic films are preserved. Much work remains in the motion picture field, and we have already started to deal with the problems of television preservation. Significant parts of our television history are already lost to us, and there is a need for a coordinated effort to make sure that this element of our national memory is not erased.

We have one film project now under way for the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration. We are producing a film for 1976 which will include scenes from the great films which have depicted the various aspects of American life. The excerpts will be selected from such films as THE BIRTH OF A NATION, MR. SMITH GOES TO WASHINGTON, THE GRAPES OF WRATH, THE SPIRIT OF ST. LOUIS, and THE RED BADGE OF COURAGE.

Regarding this, I would recommend to the Committee that the word "patriotic" be changed to read "historical and commemorative," so that it could not be thought that anything of a propaganda nature was intended.

"(3) maintain and operate a conservatory for advanced studies in the cinematic arts, cause materials developed at such conservatory to be made availble for study in other institutions, and make grants to persons who demonstrate particular promise as film-makers;"

I have described the work of the conservatory in accord with the phrase "cause materials developed at such conservatory to be made available for study in other institutions . . ." which is important for the future. We wish to produce publications, films, and videotapes based on the appearances by the gifted filmmakers at our conservatory and make these available to universities across the country which are teaching film but which do not have access to these people. There is no reason why film studies and the enjoyment of great films should be limited to a couple of metropolitan areas on the East and West Coasts.

"(4) provide technical programming assistance to exhibitors throughout the nation in order to increase the accessibility of such films to the American public;"

The experience of The American Film Institute at the Kennedy Center can be shared through technical advice and programming assistance to museums and universities across the country. The AFI can provide expert technical advice which can prevent costly mistakes in building and equipping facilities. There is increasing interest in providing first-class presentations of film classics in cities around the country, and there is a demonstrated need for professional advice and assistance which The American Film Institute is especially capable of providing.

"(5) provide for the appropriate recognition of extraordinary contributions to the art of film;"

In February of next year we will present the third Life-time Achievement Award of The American Film Institute to an artist yet to be selected but whose accomplishments will compare to the previous recipients, John Ford and James Cagney.

"(6) advise and assist educational institutions and other organizations as to methods of teaching and research, including workshops, conferences, seminars, and publications, relating to the art of motion pictures and television;"

An increasing number of universities and research centers are working in this area. The American Film Institute is presently, and will to an increasing degree, work with these institutions and provide advice and information.

"(7) solicit, accept, and dispose of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, securities, and other properties of whatsoever character for the benefit of the Institute, including contributions derived from National Film Day, theater ticket sales and American Film Institute Lifetime Achievement Award celebrations;"

This clause enables us to carry out our obligation to raise at least one-third of our budget from private sources. National Film Day is scheduled for February 4, 1975, and we will work with the motion picture industry to see that this becomes an ever-increasing source of revenue for the Institute. On that day, half of the receipts from participating theaters all across the country will be given to The American Film Institute.

"(8) obtain grants from, and make contracts with, State, Federal, local and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals;"

This enables the Institute to make application to various organizations to receive grants or to carry out work on contracts. We are presently making a particularly strong effort to obtain supplemental funding for the conservatory in California from the Arts Commission in that state.

"(9) acquire, hold, maintain, use, operate, and dispose of any physical facilities, including equipment, necessary for the administration and operation of the Institute;"

This authorizes us to maintain our facilities, including our administrative offices in the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and the AFI Theater in that building. Our facility in California for the conservatory is the former Doheny estate which we hold on a long-term lease from the City of Beverly Hills at one dollar per year.

"(10) appoint and fix the compensation of a director and such other officers and employees of the Institute as may be necessary for its efficient operation. The director and such other officers and employees shall be well qualified by experience and training in films or television to perform the duties of their office."

Compensation has been set by the private Trustees, and inasmuch the Institute remains a non-government organization, with one-third of the funds coming from the private sector, the Trustees should retain the authority to set the size, duties, and compensation of the staff. The Institute's staff presently numbers 85 employees, 50 of whom serve in our Washington operation and 35 of whom serve in California. This is down from the previous total of 107, which was the Institute's highest employment level, during fiscal year 1973. Our employees include administrative and financial personnel, theater and curatorial personnel, archivists and researchers, faculty and teachers, and technical personnel such as film projectionists.

The activities we are conducting form a large order for 85 people, but we have assembled a dedicated and talented professional staff. One virtue of this legislation is that it will signal to AFI's staff that The American Film Institute is here to stay. It has been difficult to keep top quality people in the face of the uncertainty which has plagued AFI for the last several years.

With the assured existence which this legislation provides, the AFI will seek modest increases for programming to enable us to fulfill the wide ranging needs and vast potential which I have described to you. I wish to emphasize again that the grant making to institutions which has been originated by the Public Media Panel of the Endowment should continue to be the function of that organization, and we will not be seeking funds for those purposes. We do need dependable funding for our ongoing operations and programs and increased funding for those activities which the Administration and Congress judge to be appropriate.

As to our funding, we are not proposing a great change. We presently receive nearly two million dollars annually in government funds, and the present ratio of government to private money fits in with the ratio proposed in this legislation for not more than two-thirds of AFI's funds to come from government appropriation and one-third to be raised by the private sector. We do expect to propose some new programs for next year, particularly those which we call "Outreach." Those are the programs which enable AFI to bring its special knowledge, information, expertise, and films to organizations and the general public across the country. We know we will have to justify any increase in funding, and therefore the growth and expansion of The American Film Institute will have to be related to those things that Congress thinks are justified.

In short, we seek moderate but sustained growth and, most important of all, stability.

I assure you, if The American Film Institute did not exist, we would be searching for a means to invent it. We want there to be available for the American public quality in film and television. You men and women on this Committee know better than I that you cannot legislate quality in the arts. But you can create by legislation an institution which is devoted to nurturing quality by preserving and enlarging the appreciation of the great achievements of the past so that they may be a model for artists of the future; and at the same time encouraging that institution to provide training and opportunity for new professional people who can create, in their own way, and communicate to the American public.

The American Film Institute is such an institution, and it stands ready to continue to serve that function with the passage of this legislation.

EXHIBIT TO THE STATEMENT OF GEORGE STEVENS, JR., DIRECTOR, THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

Under its proposed new structure as a nonprofit corporation, The American Film Institute would carry out activities which were assigned it when it was created by the National Endowment for the Arts in 1967. These activities are focused on the advancement of the art of motion pictures and television in the United States. The Institute functions as a national organization established for that purpose.

This summary describes the existing program and the planned activities of the AFI during FY 1975. The Institute's activities are grouped in three major program areas: *Public Programs; Preservation, Research and Documentation;* and *Education and Training.*

(1) PUBLIC PROGRAMS

The public programs of the Institute are those activities which relate most directly to the American public:

(A) Film Exhibitions
(B) Publications and Membership Services
(C) National Events and Fundraising
(D) Filmmaking Services

(A) *Film Exhibitions*

AFI Theater. The American Film Institute Theater in the Kennedy Center is the centerpiece of the Institute's public exhibition program. The theater is a unique facility which presents 400 different films a year (encompassing a wide variety of classic and contemporary works) to the general public and to AFI members. This 224 seat theater opened on April 3, 1973. Its construction was financed privately, primarily by a major gift from Jack L. Warner. The concept of repertory programming at the AFI Theater makes it comparable to a "national gallery of film." In addition to showing films which exemplify the broad history of artistic achievement, there are special educational programs for children;

historical series aimed primarily at college students; lectures by film artists and, during the tourist season, special daytime programs are offered. Presentation of this program requires a vocational staff as well as theater operating staff. Ticket prices are kept low to enable the broadest possible public participation and special fundraising programs help reduce the differential between income and expenditures.

The AFI Theater at the Kennedy Center serves as a laboratory and model of film exhibition programs and techniques for other localities.

Regional and Local Exhibitions. A collaborative program with museums and similar institutions across the nation has been in its formative stages since 1974. The Institute organizes touring programs and provides advice and assistance to film programming institutions in twelve cities. This network will be enlarged to include other localities and during the coming year the Institute will plan a special Bicentennial project which will involve a national celebration of the best films in the history of American filmmaking.

Fans of the AFI. The Fans of The American Film Institute was formed primarily as a support and fundraising unit. It is composed of interested volunteers in the Washington area who, in addition to organizing fundraising events, put on special educational programs for school children. This volunteer concept will raise at least $50,000 in FY 75 and serves as an example of volunteer effort for similar institutions in other cities.

(B) Publications and Membership

Publications and membership services provide a channel of communications with the general public. AFI's publications are primarily drawn from the actual programs of the Institute and serve to disseminate the research and knowledge accumulated in the various programs. Membership is available to the public at $15 a year and members are entitled to receive AFI publications and to attend the AFI Theater at reduced prices. There are presently approximately 6,000 members of the AFI.

Unfortunately, because of insufficient funding, the AFI has been forced this year to suspend the publication of its noteworthy periodical, the *AFI Report*. The *Report* was a quarterly which provided professional, as well as scholarly, articles and information on the film and television scenes. It is hoped that with a stabilization of the AFI's financial condition, the Institute will, again, be enabled to publish the Report with the same measure of equality attained in the past.

In 1975 the Institute will continue to publish:

(a) *Dialogue on Film*, a series of interviews with leading film artists from around the world, based on the seminars at the Center for Advanced Film Studies. Ten issues will be produced and sent to university film and television schools as well as to the AFI membership.

(b) *AFI Voice* will be published monthly providing general information about the Institute and about current developments in the film and television industries.

Two new book projects are scheduled for the coming year: *The Television and Film Annual* will provide complete data on the year's activity in film and television in the United States; *Who's Who in Film and Television* will provide a much needed source of biography data on individuals engaged in professional or scholarly work in the media of film and television. Commercial publishers will share costs on both these publications.

(C) National Events and Fundraising

Three continuing annual public events which provide private funds for the Institute in FY 75 are organized by the Institute staff with heavy involvement on the part of Trustees:

(a) *Award Dinner.* The third annual Life Achievement Award Dinner will be held to honor an individual for a lifetime of accomplishment in film or television. This is becoming one of the prestigious national awards in the field and it is organized by a volunteer committee of California Trustees and advisors supported by the AFI staff. The dinner will hopefully generate approximately $1½ million in donations for AFI. The first award dinner in 1973 paid tribute to the great American director, John Ford. James Cagney was honored in 1974.

(b) *Television Special.* The Institute will produce a 1½ hour television special on the Life Achievement Award Dinner for prime time broadcast on CBS. The Institute's seven-year option contract with CBS calls for payment of $220,000 in 1975, with escalation to $450,000 in 1979. Leading entertainment industry

figures such as Charlton Heston, Danny Kaye, John Wayne, and Jack Lemmon donate their services to the AFI television special, bringing about a substantial savings in costs. That the Dinner special has become a bona fide "media event" is demonstrated by a survey published in a recent issue of *Variety*. That poll shows that during the period from September 1, 1973 to August 31, 1974 the Dinner special honoring James Cagney attracted the ninth largest audience of the three hundred sixty-three prime time programs evaluated. Among the eight programs which out-drew the AFI special were three World Series Games, the Academy Awards program, the Miss America Pageant, the showing of the movie *Airport*, and the Waltons Thanksgiving Story.

(c) *National Film Day.* The second annual National Film Day will take place on February 4, 1975. National Film Day is a major collaboration which began in 1973 among participating theater owners and distributors, who provide 50 percent of their boxoffice revenue on Film Day to AFI as a contribution to its work. The President of the United States and governors and mayors from many parts of the country issued proclamations for the first Film Day, and the Institute anticipates an ever growing participation from the industry in this annual event. Revenue from the first Film Day was $85,000 and we project that FY 75 income will more than double that amount. In the first year over 4,000 theaters participated.

(3) *Filmmaking Services*

Filmmaking services refers to the Institute's capability in producing or contracting for such films as are appropriate to its function. The Institute is currently engaged in planning and research for a major Bicentennial film for showing in the Bicentennial year at the Kennedy Center and other localities.

(2) PRESERVATION, RESEARCH, AND DOCUMENTATION

One of the original reasons for the founding of The American Film Institute was to establish a point of national collaboration for the preservation of film materials of artistic and historical value. Related to it are projects of research and documentation on film and television.

(A) *Motion Picture and Television Preservation*

Motion Picture Preservation. The preservation of motion pictures is a major conservation project. The Institute established and coordinated a national program in 1967, and, in collaboration with the Library of Congress and other motion pictures archives and libraries, substantial progress has been made. One result is the AFI Collection in the Library of Congress consisting of over 12,500 films valued at $71.9 million. To help coordinate this effort the Institute helped establish the AFI Archives Advisory Committee. The Institute seeks out and accepts films of artistic or historic importance and makes grants to other institutes for the transfer of nitrate films to permanent acetate film.

Television Preservation. The Institute is presently setting up the structure for coordinating the preservation of television material under a plan similar to that for motion pictures. The Institute will, once again, coordinate its operational activities in this field with other interested institutions.

Artifacts. As part of its preservation program, the Institute has acquired a small number of historical artifacts which were in danger of destruction or loss. Some of these are on display in the Kennedy Center.

The Institute will continue to collect as many of these artifacts as it can handle and at the same time investigate the long term needs in preserving the important artifacts of the history of film.

(B) *Motion Picture and Television Research*

The American Film Institute Catalog. The American Film Institute Catalog is a research project to assemble complete data on all motion pictures made in the United States. This project has been funded on a matching grant basis by the National Endowment for the Humanities. The first volume of this catalog *Feature Films 1931–1940*, has been published. It is a 1653 page, two-book set and contains exhaustive data on 6,596 films. *Feature Films 1911–1920* and *Feature Films 1961–1970* are presently being researched and compiled on a computer for publication under the NEH contract.

Oral History Program. The Oral History Program is funded by L. B. Mayer Foundation at a level of $50,000 per year. Grants are made in two categories: Oral History and Research Associateships. The oral histories are extended interviews with film figures of historical importance and more than 40 of these have

been completed in the past three years. Research associateships involve comprehensive studies of film activity of historical importance.

Feldman Library. At this facility, located at the Center for Advanced Film Studies, film scripts and other data pertinent to film education are collected and made available to scholars, writers, and researchers. The Library had to be closed down briefly in 1974 because of the Institute's cash flow difficulties, but it has now re-opened with a reduced staff.

AFI Research Center. During the next year the Institute will explore the feasibility of establishing a research center within the Institute for comprehensive and computerization of data on film and television.

(3) EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Fulfilling its responsibilities to lead the development of skills in filmmaking through training programs and grants, the Institute has undertaken a number of activities. The centerpiece of these is a national conservatory in California called the Center for Advanced Film Studies.

(A) *Center for Advanced Film Studies*

The Institute has taken the leadership role in the training of film and television artists. At the CAFS the most outstanding advanced new writers, directors, and cinematmen study under the tutelage of leading professional artists and craftsmen. Fifty fellows are enrolled full time in the two-year curriculum, and many other professional and pre-professional people are involved in part-time study. The program includes seminars; workshops with professional guilds such as the Screen Actors Guild, the American Society of Cinematographers, and the Screen Writers Guild; and extensive video and filmmaking activities. Guided by an advisory committee of professionals, the CAFS chooses fellows annually from over 400 applicants and provides special assistance and opportunity for professional placement of its graduates.

(B) *Center Extension Activities*

A major new thrust of the CAFS in the next year will be activation of its plan for providing teaching materials and services to many of the 668 universities in the United States which now give courses in film and television.

Teaching Materials. The Center's curriculum, its seminars and its workshops are the basis of publications, video tapes, and touring lectures. These will relate directly to the arts and crafts of the filmmaking profession which are at present available only in minimum quantity and quality.

Internships. One of the most successful programs from the outset of the Institute has been the project whereby promising new filmmakers are placed in learning experiences alongside leading film directors on professional productions. To date, more than 57 filmmakers have served as Interns. Fourteen Internships will be provided during the next year. Half of these will be funded on a grant from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. Directors who have participated as tutors in the program include: Arthur Penn, Elia Kazan, Mike Nichols, and Stanley Kramer.

(C) *Independent Filmmakers Program*

Since 1968 the Institute has given grants to independent filmmakers to enable the most talented film artists to advance their professional careers. Grants are limited to a maximum of $10,000 and, to date, 122 filmmakers have received assistance. Grantees are selected by a panel of advisors composed of outstanding creative people from the film and television profession. In FY 75 the Institute will give between 25 and 30 grants.

(D) *Educational Coordination*

This office coordinates AFI's educational activities internally to ensure that the various programs and departments do not overlap. It works externally with the educational community at large and with universities through AFI's University Advisory Committee. If funding permits, AFI will hold a national conference of educators to examine the future of film and television education and training. In 1975 the Institute will produce the fifth edition of its semi-annual *Guide to Courses in Film and Television.*

GENERAL COMMENT

The proposed status and funding relationship with the government is intended to regularize the Institute's relationship with the Federal Government as well as give it statutory standing and continuity. The dependable flow of government funds will provide sufficient stability for the Institute to continue to expend its private resources, thereby maintaining the concept of the Institute as a partnership between the public and the private sectors. The Institute will work to maintain and enlarge its private following including its membership program and the various volunteer aspects of the AFI. At the same time, the Institute will explore the needs of government agencies so as to attract as many contracts and grants as possible to support specific activities of the Institute and minimize the level of direct appropriation.

SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS AT THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE CENTER FOR ADVANCED FILM STUDIES

ACTORS/ACTRESSES

Richard Attenborough
Lucille Ball
Jack Benny
Robert Blake
Lynn Carlin
Leslie Caron
Richard Chamberlain
Peter Falk
Nina Foch
Henry Fonda
Charlton Heston
Jack Lemmon
Harold Lloyd
Jack Nicholson
Robert Stephens
Ingrid Thulin
Liv Ullmann
Jon Voight

EXHIBIT A

DIRECTORS/PRODUCERS

Perry Miller Adato
Robert Aldrich
Hal Ashby
Laslo Benedek
Candro S. Bergman
Bernardo Bertolucci
James Bridges
Budd Boetticher
Sergei Bondarchuk
Stan Brakhage
Warren Bush
John Cassavetes
Constantin Costa-Gavras
Merian C. Cooper
Roger Corman
George Cukor
Jacques Demy
Brian DePalma
Charles Eames
Ed Emshwiller
Federico Fellini
Milos Forman
William Friedkin
Curtis Harrington
Howard Hawks
Alfred Hitchcock
Conrad Holzgang
John Huston
Peter Hyams
Jan Kadar
Irvin Kershner
Stanley Kramer
Steve Krantz
Richard Leacock
Barbara Loden
Terrence Malick
Rouben Mamoulian
Andrew Marton
Paul Mazursky
Vicente Minnelli
Ronald Neame
George Pal
Roman Polanski
Nicholas Ray
Jean Renoir
Tamas Renyi
Martin Ritt
Roberto Rossellini
George Seaton
Sidney Sheldon
Alexander Singer
Vilgot Sjoman
Steven Spielberg
Mel Stuart
Robert Totten
Hal Wallis
Raoul Walsh
Max Weinberg
Lawrence Weingarten
Jiri Weiss
Haskell Wexler
Oscar Williams
Paul Williams
Michael Winner
David Wolper
Fred Zinnemann

42-820—74——5

WRITERS

Herbert Baker
James Bridges
William Bowers
Ray Bradbury
Frank Daniel
Lonne Elder, III
Terrence Malick
Paul Mazursky
Carl Reiner
Matthew Robbins
Budd Schulberg
Leonard Spigelgass
Oscar Williams
Tracy Kennan Wynn

GENERAL TOPICS

Ray Bradbury
Harry Schein
Petro Vlahos

ART DIRECTORS/SET DESIGNERS

Gene Allen
Harry Horner

CINEMATOGRAPHERS

Lee Garmes
Conrad Hall
James Wong Howe
Hal Mohr
Joseph Ruttenberg

COMPOSERS

Elmer Bernstein
John Green
Henry Mancini
Alex North

COSTUME DESIGNERS

Edith Head

FILM CRITICS

Yvette Biro
Lotte Eisner
Andrew Sarris

LABORATORY PROCESSES

Ted Fogelman
Sid Solow

EDITORS

Frank P. Keller
Bud Smith

INDUSTRY PEOPLE

Walter Hurst
Gordon Stulberg

PRODUCTION MANAGERS

Jonathan Haze
Lee Katz

SCRIPT CLERK

Hannah Sheeld

SPECIAL EFFECTS

Linwood Dunn

STORY EDITOR

William Fadiman

STUNT MEN

Jerry Randall and Joe Hooker

TELEVISION

Bob Christiansen
Hartford N. Gunn
Rick Rosenberg
Thomas W. Sarnoff with Edward Adler, Fenton Coe, Robert T. Howards, Henry Rieger, Stanley Robertson
Donald Taverner
Bernard Wiesen

American Filmmakers Who Have Accepted American Film Institute Interns on Their Productions

Hal Ashby
John Barry
Noel Black
Peter Bogdanovich
Robert Boyle
Francis Ford Coppola
Gordon Davidson
Richard Fleischer
John Frankheimer
James Goldstone
Curtis Harrington
George Roy Hill
Arthur Hiller
Peter Hyams
Elia Kazan
Gene Kelly
Irvin Kershner
Stanley Kramer
Richard Leacock
Jack Lemmon
Alex March
Jim McBride
Robert Mulligan
Mike Nichols
Alan Pakula
Edward Parone
Sam Peckinpah
Arthur Penn
Martin Ritt
Herbert Ross
John Schlesinger
Barry Shear
Mel Shavelson
Don Siegel
Steven Spielberg
Douglas Trumbull
Lawrence Turman
Haskell Wexler
Billy Wilder
Paul Williams
Robert Wise
Peter Yates
Howard Zieff

AFI Films Receiving Prizes and Awards

Arena	Istvan Ventilla	Main Prize; Oberhausen Sports Film Festival, 1970.
Camden, Tex	James Bryan	Prize; Ann Arbor Film Festival, 1970.
College Daze	Tom Berman	Second Prize; Chicago International Film Festival, 1969.
The Father	Mark Fine	Cine Gold Eagle, 1971 Bronze Award; Atlanta International Film Festival, 1971.
The Good Friend	James Murakami	Silver Award; Mamaia Animation Festival, Romania, 1970.
The Grandmother	David Lynch	Gold Medal; Atlanta Film Festival, 1970.
Imogen Cunningham, photographer.	John Korty	Silver Medal; Atlanta International Film Festival, 1971.
Mississippi Summer	William Bayer	Gold Hugo Award; Chicago International Film Festival, 1970.
A Question To Mr. Humphrey.	Edwin Lynch	Cine Gold Eagle, 1969.
Sticky My Fingers, Fleet My Feet.	John Hancock	Cine Gold Eagle, 1970, Academy Award; nomination.
My Son, The King	Robert Kurtz	Silver Medal; Atlanta International Film Festival, 1971.
Intermissions	Gill Dennis	Cine Gold Eagle Certificate; 1973.
Journey	Tom Moore	Cine Gold Eagle Certificate; 1973.
Coming On	Doe Mayer	Cine Gold Eagle Certificate; 1973.
The Love Song of Charles Faberman.	Jeremy Kagan	Selected for participation in Edinburgh and Mannheim Film Festivals, 1973.
Yesterday's Shore, Tomorrow's Morning.	Eva Lothar	Cine Gold Eagle Certificate; 1973.

AFI Films Receiving Prizes and Awards—Continued

Young Goodman Brown	Don Fox	International Film Festival, Atlanta, Golden Medal and Special Judges Award, 1973; Selected for participation in New York Film Festival and FILMEX, 1972.
Blood's Way	Stan Taylor	Silver Medal; International Film Festival, Atlanta, 1973.
Wednesday	Mary Kupfer	Cine Gold Eagle Certificate; 1973; Gold Medal for Best Short Subject Dramatic, Atlanta International Film Festival, 1973; Silver Dragon Award, Krac w International Film Festival

Mr. Brademas. Could we now invite to testify Dr. [illegible] Culkin and Mr. Ed Lynch.

Gentlemen, I regret we are running late, but you can tell from our earlier conversations we have a number of questions.

Mr. Culkin. I would prefer to submit my paper and make some brief comments.

Mr. Lynch. Speaking for myself, I would like to present my views to the whole committee in view of the fact that my request is really a constituency request.

Mr. Culkin. And I would prefer to make a brief statement now.

Mr. Brademas. Mr. Lynch, we will be glad to hear from you tomorrow if it is convenient for you.

Mr. Lynch. Yes, thank you.

Mr. Brademas. Proceed, Mr. Culkin.

STATEMENT OF JOHN CULKIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR UNDERSTANDING MEDIA

Mr. Culkin. My name is John Culkin, executive director of the Center for Understanding Media, a nonprofit organization involved in film and television education.

I was one of the founding trustees of the American Film Institute and served on the Board for 5 years until my resignation 2 years ago. The paper that I have presented as summarizing my statement is really an agenda of questions I would like to see dealt with rather than a finely honed definitive statement on my part. The remarks are separated into two categories, one of policy, which has to do with the centralization of resources in an emerging field which increasingly is going toward pluralism and regionalism.

The second issue that I address myself to in my statement is one of performance, that we are not talking in the abstract about an institute which will have such great power and influence over the movie image in the not-for-profit sector.

We are not talking in the abstract, but talking about an institution that has a 7-year history. I think it is fair at this time, both for the strengthening of those aspects of the movie image area that the film institute can serve, and also for the many other organizations and individuals in the field, that there be some audit and assessment of the responsiveness of the American Film Institute over this 7-year history both as to its original mandate and to the organizations and individuals who also are working in the vineyard of the movie image.

Therefore, I make a suggestion that at a time like this when we are making a bordermark decision, that we seek as much dialog, that we extend out as far as possible across the country to other organizations and individuals on what they feel about the past performance of the film institute and what they think the film institute can do best and where they think the limitations in the film institute are.

The kinds of questions I would prefer to ask are listed here. My recommendation is a simple one, that there be set up an independent commission or some sort, which could at this point in time do something similar to what the Stanford Research Institute did 7 years ago, that the biblical 7 years has passed, that it is time to look back and look forward and that independent judgment, both on the performance of the Film Institute and on the changing character of the not-for-profit movie image field, demand a new look at the priorities which might be established and then also an assessment of the ability of the American Film Institute to serve those needs.

So my suggestions are very brief, that such a committee or commission of independent citizens be established to do this reserve task and, second, that hearings, both on a national and regional basis, be opened up to allow the kind of regionalism and pluralism that we are moving toward to be reflected in the final deliberations because this is a very important decision and it is one that can affect this particular field which deals with the minds and emotions of people and it is probably the most important medium taken collectively, film and television, within our culture.

I would stand with E. B. White who said, "Television is going to be the test of the modern world" and if we are making decisions about that medium, and Mr. Morris Ernst's remarks that "No culture can be much better than its mass media," that I would think the kind of careful research in the past history and establishment of new priorities would be very important to this committee.

[Dr. Culkin's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN CULKIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR UNDERSTANDING MEDIA, NEW YORK, N.Y.

INTRODUCTION

This outline is an attempt to establish a context within which the issues raised by the proposed amendment can be further explored and resolved. The witness has been active in the educational aspects of film and television for more than ten years. He was one of the founding trustees of the American Film Institute and served on its Board for five years until his resignation two years ago.

These brief remarks will be summed up under three headings:

(1) Policy
(2) Performance
(3) Recommendations

As often as possible, they will be presented without comment to underscore their character as items for an agenda rather than as a list of definitive judgments.

1. POLICY

There are issues of public policy involved in this amendment which have implications reaching beyond the medium of film and beyond the American Film Institute. This wider context must, therefore, be considered along with the specific recommendations of the amendment.

a. The precedent which may be established for other art and media forms and the organizations which serve them to seek similar legislation.

b. The influence of such legislation on existing not-for-profit organizations in the film and television field.

c. The concentration of the major portion of public funding in a single organization.

d. The method of securing the suggestions and cooperation of the constituency to be represented by this organization.

e. The relationship between this centralized approach and the pluralistic and regional modes of development which are now dominant in the field.

f. The danger of imposing too rigid a structure on an art form which is still emerging and still being defined.

g. The mechanism for ensuring representation on the Board for the many and diverse constituencies active in film and television.

h. The continuity or non-continuity between the existing organization and the one proposed in the amendment.

2. PERFORMANCE

The questions of policy are legitimate and valid in the abstract, as modes of examining the kind of structure for an organization to serve a particular constituency. In dealing specifically with the appropriateness of the American Film Institute to become the major publicly funded agency to serve the film and television field, there are reasonable criteria of performance which must be considered for an organization which already has been active in the field for a period of seven years. Such questions must in fairness be asked within a context which respects the complexity and newness of the field, the inevitable growing pains associated with a new organization and the realism of the expectations which both the Institute and the field originally inspired.

Some value judgments must be applied to this seven years of performance to establish the qualifications of the Institute to accomplish any or all of the goals set forth in the amendment and to act on behalf of or in cooperation with other individuals and organizations in the moving image field. The following are some suggested areas which might be treated in such an assessment.

a. The ability to inspire confidence, respect and trust among the constituents it was founded and funded to serve.

b. The quality, morale and continuity of the staff members of the Institute.

c. The ability to develop a diversified schedule of funding from both public and private agencies.

d. The performance record of the Institute in the judgment of those who have funded its activities.

e. The quality of leadership of the administration of the Institute.

f. The priorities of the Institute both as established in its initial charter and as modified during its seven year history.

g. The record of its dealings and agreements with individual filmmakers, educators, publishers and other organizations in the field.

h. Its responsiveness to the expressed needs of its constituency.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

There is no easy or quick way to deal with the questions of policy and performance raised in these pages. There is likewise no doubt as to the importance of facing up to these and other issues in the process of making an informed decision on the proposed amendment. The following recommendations are, therefore, put forth as steps in the process to explore the issues of policy and performance and to provide a comprehensive context within which such an important decision can be made.

a. The establishment of an independent commission to study and report on both the policy and performance issues involved in the proposed amendment.

b. The convening of a series of well-publicized open hearings on both a national and regional basis to allow the fullest and most open discussion possible.

The decision before us merits such careful study and such open discussion.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Dr. Culkin. I want to commend you on what I think is a set of extremely thoughtful suggestions. I might make just a comment or two and you might wish to respond.

As I look at your series of questions on page 1 under "Policy," I must say that my first instinct was to think with an exception or two everyone of those questions might appropriately be put in respect of the theater, the dance, poetry, and painting.

Mr. CULKIN. We are back in metaphysics again.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That does not gainsay my own view that those are first-class questions. Indeed, some of your questions also go back to the colloquy I had with Miss Hanks, which I raised because there are very serious questions with which she, in her responsibility, must be concerned and we as legislators must be concerned. The whole spectrum of issues that involve the diversity of support and the maintenance of pluralistic patterns of support of arts and artists of the United States is complicated. On that I know she and I, and I take it you and I, are in agreement and then when we get into specifics, reasonable people will have differing points of view.

But I think that one of the matters that is always in the back of my head, as one of those who supported Federal moneys for the arts, earlier on, when we didn't have such widespread support, is that we want always to be sure that we do not create the specter of the Government of the United States dictating the direction of the arts.

Obviously, what the Government does will have some impact.

Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. It will have impact on the direction, that is a prerogative of a democracy, but we are walking that tightrope. I think that your question of the danger of imposing too rigid a structure on an art form which is still being defined is the kind of question that might well be put to this committee.

Mr. CULKIN. Yes; it is not one where knowing the question does not presume I have an answer to it. That is why I indicated that.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am also sympathetic to your suggestion of some sort of inquiry into the operations of the AFI, even as I am sympathetic to that kind of approach toward the operation of some of the other activities that may be funded by the National Government in the arts. Today one of the problems we have on this subcommittee is probing deeply enough, given limited resources of our own, but I will share your suggestion with my colleagues.

Mr. CULKIN. There might also be the possibility that because the films are a latecomer on the cultural scene and, as a result, in many foundations for instance there is not staff adequately prepared to make intelligent judgments on film proposals that come before them and for this reason a number of foundations are currently looking in, finally, to what their roles should be in the new media and I would think that it might be possible to have such an independent study made with funds which would not necessarily come from this committee.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would just say, finally, that I hope that among the subjects that will be considered, which is not strictly within the concern of the National Arts Endowment or of the AFI, but certainly is on the minds of many of us on this committee, is the whole question of the impact of television as an instrument of education. That properly comes within the rubric of the Commerce Committee, but, because this is the Education Committee, we have to be concerned about this also.

Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Dr. Culkin, for your most useful statement.

The Chair will conclude the hearing by an announcement that we shall resume these hearings tomorrow morning in this room at 9:45 a.m.

[Whereupon, at 12:50 p.m. the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 9:45 a.m. of the following day, Tuesday, October 8, 1974.]

TO CREATE THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The select subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Brademas (chairman of the special subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Brademas, Lehman, Peyser, Sarasin, and Badillo.

Staff present: Jack G. Duncan, counsel; Yvonne Franklin, minority legislative assistant.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor will come to order to continue hearings on H.R. 17021, a bill to establish the American Film Institute as an independent agency.

The Chair wants to observe that the bill was introduced in the House with impressive bipartisan backing, and yesterday we heard from a distinguished group of witnesses, and today we look forward to hearing from a number of other authorities in this field.

We shall begin our hearing with Mr. Ed Lynch, president of the Association of Independent Video and Filmmakers, Inc., New York.

Mr. Lynch, the Chair hopes his colleagues will trickle in as the morning wears on.

STATEMENT OF ED LYNCH, PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT VIDEO AND FILMMAKERS, INC., NEW YORK

Mr. LYNCH. We have put together a letter statement that we felt best reflected our particular concerns about the legislation. I would like to read it, but in view of the testimony at yesterday's hearing, what I would like to do is interrupt my reading occasionally and make comments that are more pertinent than what we have been talking about rather than just to continue the letter.

Gentlemen, the Association of Independent Video and Filmmakers, Inc., would like to go on record against the proposed legislation H.R. 17021, that would set up a separate funding for the American Film Institute and remove it from the funding jurisdiction of the National Endowments for the Arts.

We feel that the effect of this proposal would be to give the new institute a favored position in the field without evidence that it has the support of the people in the field.

We are an organization of over 200 film and video artists and craftspeople. We have not been surveyed. We have not been consulted.

We consider the difference between the proposal, the present funding alinement and the proposed one to be profound. The extraordinary issues raised by this proposal deserve more time for investigation and research. In fact, the brief period of time between the introduction of the bill and these hearings did not allow us to prepare an appropriate response, either on the real needs of the field, most of which are not in dispute, or on the performance of the American Film Institute during the past 7 years.

There is a vast amount of evidence that needs to be consulted. There is a new study on independent filmmakers, commissioned by the Markle Foundation, that engaged far-ranging questions about the health and welfare of the independent from funding through distribution. There are other organizations that might also like to have a special funding advantage, or which at the very least would like to be consulted on how this legislation would affect their efforts in film and video arts. There are many artists who have had experiences with the AFI and other funding sources who could be helpful in planning the future of the American Film Institute and other broader film and video alternatives.

The simple fact is that there is widespread dissatisfaction among filmmakers with the American Film Institute.

I would like to stop here because, in a sense, that is what we have come down here to say. It is not a statement made lightly, and it is not a statement that we would have liked to have made. A lot of filmmakers have received support from the American Film Institute and it is sort of like the little bit we did get we are criticized for, and it seems to be a little unfair. But it would have been a disservice to my constituency to say anything less.

I would like to continue by saying that the cause for that dissatisfaction might superficially seem to be a general lack of funds. But it is clear that other funding sources, also with limited funds, such as State arts councils and the National Endowment, do not have the same reputation as the AFI. The cause of the dissatisfaction must be investigated. The lack of foundation support is conspicuous; the withdrawal of Ford Foundation funding needs an explanation.

We will not argue that film and video are not a special case. But any new legislation must be founded on a clear understanding of the past and an extraordinary vision about the future. We know from our own struggles that this proposal is a clear reflection of a need. But we are also convinced that the best minds have not been consulted and that the appropriate research is not in evidence. We are ready to assist in supporting or planning a truly open, service-oriented nationally funded film organization.

Toward that end the Association of Independent Video and Filmmakers recommends that the Select Subcommittee on Education:

1. Schedule additional hearings as a fundamental expression of fairness and intention to allow full participation by its constituency.

2. Make a commitment to a basic understanding of the whole problem of independent expression in film and video, and insist that any recommended legislation be consistent with the needs of the whole field.

3. Compare the full assistance programs of other governments, with special emphasis on priorities and independence.

4. Insist that any organization that will receive the benefit of special Government funding have the support of its constituency and of the people in the field.

5. Ask or commission an impartial body to ask the pertinent questions about the past performance of the American Film Institute, both from the viewpoint of the filmmaker and the policymaker.

6. Ask other film organizations to participate with them in the planning of any legislation as a reasonably prudent way to gain support and to avoid devisive competition and duplication.

We will not argue that film and video are not a special case. And I might add here that we have been arguing so long, so long that is a special case because a lot of things have been brought up by this committee, which is that it is an expensive art form, it is more expensive than symphonies, as Charlton Heston said yesterday, and we admitted it is a special case.

Everyone in this country sees movies and television at a rate that far exceeds any other art form. Therefore, we continue to insist that it is a special problem.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Lynch, for a very provocative and interesting statement.

Let me ask you two or three questions. First of all, would you define for me your own association so that I have some idea of what the Independent Video and Filmmakers Association is, it represents?

Mr. LYNCH. Well, I am the president of the association. I have spent better than a year organizing and I was supported through the Office of Education by a grant through the Center for Understanding Media who asked me what I thought needed to be done in the field, and for a year I spent, on a small, more or less weekly retainer, enough time, energy and money to organize the Independent Video Filmmakers.

I surveyed—and I would like to read into the record some of the research and some of the things that could give you an idea about exactly what sort of effort I have made.

We did have to report not too long ago back to the Office of Education and give them an idea about exactly how we had been using Government money and whether or not we had been serving our constituency. So to give you an idea, some of these names are familiar to the independent field. This is the kind of survey I had done to make sure I was serving the constituency.

Earlier it was thought we could have an organization along the lines of the American Film Institute, which was more benevolent and more autonomous, but we found the filmmakers would not support that type of organization. If I were asking the help of the filmmakers I would have to give them a voice in the association. I would like to give you a perspective on that.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would be glad to hear such a perspective from you, but I am trying to get a definition. I am not being combative, I am trying to get a definition of what is the Association of Video and Filmmakers, your constituency. Who are you?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir. That is what I am trying to do.

Many of these people are now members, Steven Aaronson, Emily

Rothschild, Jerry Brook, Frank Moynahan, Lehman Brandon, Lillion Schwartz, Joe DeKoa, Robert Greer, Claudia Wild, Richard Pierce, Annette Michaelson, Leo Dratfield, Cliff Frazer, George Skoner, Barbara Van Dyke, and many, many more independent people in the field who have consulted in the organizational field and have participated in the function of the association. We have also been in consultation with the American Federation of the Arts, Yellow Ball Workshop, New York Film Makers Cooperative, New Day Films, Billy Budd Films, the Women's Cooperative, Media Center, New Yorker Films, Film Forum, Millenium Film Workshop, and to not belabor the point, there is another page of what I consider to be the constituency of the film audience in this country and specifically where I have been working on the east coast.

Many of these people send regular members to our meetings. We have over 500 on our mailing list and, since we recently decided we offered benefits of a character that deserved formal membership in an organization which really borders on something like a trade association, because we feel, we can offer each other, if we get together, things very fundamental like equipment insurance, information, and legal help, and things like that, that we are charging a membership fee.

The association now has over 200 members, most of whom are active and working in the field.

Mr. BRADEMAS. What is your annual budget?

Mr. LYNCH. We are absolutely unfunded at this point. The only money that we have at this point is probably around $400 and that is from the dues of the members. Our budget, hopefully, will be increased through requets from grants at a time in which we can place ourselves in the normal request for funding and we hope to be able to get foundation support and State arts council support.

I think, frankly, this depends on our proving that we are a service organization of video filmmakers.

Mr. BRADEMAS. How long have you been in existence?

Mr. LYNCH. We have been having meetings for about a year. We consider ourselves a new organization. On the other hand, a lot of us have been in contact with and worked with others. On the other hand, it has been a competitive organization and in getting together we have been able to show our interests are not in opposition but we really need to have a piece of a larger film budget which I think could come out of the industry rather than being competitive between ourselves.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Has the study on independent filmmakers commissioned by the Markle Foundation—to which you referred—been completed yet?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, the study has been completed but it has not been published.

Mr. BRADEMAS. When is that likely to be made public?

Mr. LYNCH. I was asked by the Markle Foundation to be a reader on that subject and I think it would be premature for me to divulge much of it. It is critical of the AFI. It surveyed vast numbers of filmmakers and talked to them at length and there are vast numbers of tapes of conversations with them. Their conclusions about the

AFI—which I am sure must be published, there is that much force behind it—that is a result of having surveyed that many filmmakers in that much of the industry.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I note in point 3 of your statement you remark upon the film assistance programs of other governments with special interest on priorities and independents. Can you tell me if other governments—like the Canadians, for example, where there is a film board—give substantial public support to independent filmmakers?

I am just searching for analogs to your points.

Mr. Lynch, I don't really consider myself to be an expert and I would like to say that is precisely one of the reasons I am here, to say that we need to study it.

I can say frankly the reason the Canadian Film Board does have some automatic benefits is because the industry is not industry oriented. They decided when they founded it, it would be for the purpose of telling the Canadian story. That is in a sense as if we asked the AFI to do that in this country. We decided not to do that and it may be a wise decision. But the fact, it is out of the industry, that obviates the problems of the market and character of the film that the Canadian Film Board produces.

Mr. BRADEMAS. From your own perspective you are critical of the operation of the AFI to date and of this particular proposal. Could you tell us in particular, aside from some of the procedural points you have been making, how would you envision the appropriate role for independent filmmakers in any kind of film institute that would be supported with public funds? I am trying to get at the heart of your point.

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, I understand. I would like to see any structure that was in legislation form provide for participation by the artists. I think the artists in the country have really not been very far away from the poor. I think the Office of Education in their grants actually called us our own genuine little poverty pocket because we have such an enduring quality that we don't seem to go away and they felt it was necessary to deal with us on retraining and in the economic mainstream because we simply seem to refuse to save ourselves by leaving the field.

I think under those circumstances we have a tenacious idea about what is good for ourselves. In that sense, I think the old, at one time more popular political point of view was, that you could tell the poor what was good for them. I don't think it is good to tell the artists what is good for them. I think they are reasonable. I think the filmmakers had the name of hotheads. I think we have a terrific understanding of what the country needs and I think, therefore, we belong on the level of policy representing ourselves as well as on the level of actually producing the art of form.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much. I hope that despite some of your criticisms of our own procedures you would at least agree your presence here demonstrates you are being consulted.

Mr. Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no questions. I enjoyed your testimony.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Lynch, there are other questions we would like to put to you, and I hope you don't mind if we put them in writing so we can have the benefit of your more specific suggestions. I would be happy if you would let the committee have them.

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir. In fact, one of the regrets of the association was the fact we didn't have the time to propose some sort of structure and we hope to continue in contact with the committee in perhaps hearings, or additional evidence of the association.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would like you to submit to us any suggestions you may care to.

Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Next I think we shall resume our questioning of Mr. George Stevens.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE STEVENS, DIRECTOR, AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE, ACCOMPANIED BY RICHARD BRANDT, CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Richard Brandt, chairman of our executive committee, has come from New York and, if it suits the Chair, it might be helpful if we could testify jointly.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Fine. Why don't you come up, Mr. Brandt. If you have a statement at the outset, go ahead and then we will ask questions.

Mr. BRANDT. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have some notes I would like to talk about first, and then, of course, I would be glad to answer or discuss any questions.

My name is Richard Brandt. I reside in Connecticut. I am chairman of the board and president of the Translux Corp. and I am an exhibitor. An exhibitor is a theater owner. I am involved in theaters in the States of Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Virginia, Indiana, Oklahoma, Michigan, North Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Louisiana, and Missouri.

I am on the board of directors and executive committee of the National Association of Theater Owners. We call it NATO. It has no relation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I am presently a trustee, and have been for several years, of the American Film Institute, and I am presently the chairman of its executive committee, which involves me in many of the aspects of the administrative areas of the AFI.

Basically, I think we are all here because the motion picture today is the literature of the 20th Century. Many of us—all of us under 30 and many of us over 30—watch more television and more film programs than we read. Whether that is fortunate or unfortunate, it is a fact.

Our literature, our information, our communications come to us through the field and through the medium of film.

Because of the tremendous importance of film as an art form, as a means of communication, and as a literature, I think that is why we are here, and that is why the AFI was formed some seven years ago.

The AFI envisages three basic purposes: One is its archival work. No art form can survive without a history. In the case of film, it is a very complex problem, technologically and economically. Just to mention one of the complexities, the destruction of nitrate film by just letting it sit. And this is one of the problems that the AFI has been working on along with other archival institutions.

In addition to that, preserving film is just one part of the job.

Another part—extraordinarily complex because of the copyright situations involved—is the problem of allowing people to see what has been preserved. Our books are in libraries, and we can read them. Our films generally are not in libraries and in many cases they are not available, and their copyrights are in such a strange state that you can't even find out who owns some of them.

I think part of the work of the AFI—for which we have not the funds at the moment, but which we are in an excellent position to work on—is to make such prints available to students and to people interested in the cultural history of the motion picture industry, and in whatever the motion picture industry has recorded.

Basically, as I am sure was mentioned yesterday, this is America's art form and in it are America's records and America's attitudes. They certainly deserve to be preserved.

From an educational point of view—again because of the complexities of making motion pictures—the AFI hopes and has plans not only to educate people directly but also to teach teachers how to teach. The technique of film teaching is still a new art, a new field; and there is a lot to be learned and a lot to be taught in this area. We hope through several of our outreach programs to spread on a national basis the information we glean and disseminate throughout the country.

In addition to, or as part of the educational process, publications, of course, become the lifeblood; our commentaries, critiques, and treatises are the tools with which we hope to hone a sharp edge on the talents and the know-how of people and of an art form; and of course, we rely primarily on our laboratory in Greystone on the west coast.

Greystone is the center for advance studies and continues to become even more so. It is an extraordinary facility for expert and professional teaching. You really have to be there and look at it and watch what happens, and I am sure you will hear from people, if you haven't already, who have participated in that program.

We are fortunate enough to be able to get professionals of every type in every creative field, editors, actors, directors, writers, independent filmmakers—I should say dependent filmmakers—in helping us to do this.

Let me talk for a moment about the particular area of the motion picture industry out of which I come. I have just left a national convention of theater owners in Atlanta, Ga., which is going to go on for the rest of this week.

At that national convention—as represented by over 10,000 theaters throughout the United States; it represents theaters of every type; downtown, shopping centers, twins, quadruplexes, drive-ins, you name it and we've got it—in a unanimous vote on Sunday at NATO—not the treaty organization but the National Association of Theater Owners—NATO passed a resolution in favor of the passage of this bill.

NATO has been the basic support behind one of the major private funding methods of the American Film Institute. The theater owners throughout the country last year agreed to give 50 percent of one night's receipts—it was October of 1973—and the film distributors who owned the film agreed to give their portion of the 50 percent, that they would normally get as film rental, toward the AFI. We called it National Film Day, and a second National Film Day is now being planned for February of 1975 and it looks like it is going to be bigger than ever.

Right now we are recruiting members of NATO and other theater owners outside of NATO for the purpose of getting them signed up for National Film Day.

I can tell you that we were extremely successful—as of yesterday when I left Atlanta—in getting most of the major circuits and many hundreds of independent film owners.

The theater owners get nothing out of this. There is no advantage to them in having an American Film Institute, at least no direct advantage except as citizens of the United States. But they feel an obligation and they have undertaken that obligation and I think they have been extremely successful in doing it.

Basically, Mr. Chairman, that covers my statement.

Now, I understand that there were certain specific matters that were brought up yesterday that I would like to comment on, if I may.

George, unless you want to go ahead with yours?

Mr. STEVENS. However the chairman wishes to do it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will ask you to be as pointed as you can because we have a very lengthy list of witnesses following you.

Mr. BRANDT. Subgranting has been a discussion between the NEA and ourselves for some years. Some years ago we came to an agreement that we would do the subgranting for filmmakers and by the archival work; and we have found no conflict whatsoever in handling that. We agreed at the same time we would not do subgranting in regard to filmmaking on other arts. For example, if there were a film on ballet, that would not be under our aegis. I am somewhat surprised that it comes up as a question.

Spinoff—I think that the AFI is so atypical of the questions, of the organization supported by the NEA that there is no possibility that this could become a common action where organizations are spun off from the NEA. The AFI gets roughly $2 million a year from the NEA under various funding programs. It includes a general operating budget which is not typical of the NEA grant programs and, therefore, I don't think we are setting any precedent whatsoever in passing this bill.

Another question that I understand was raised yesterday was: would it be possible, were it necessary, to raise 50 percent of our funds through private funding. And I think this is a very important point. An organization like the AFI has to have a certain critical mass before it can really do its full work. Some of the objections you have heard or might hear from people who feel they have not been adequately supported by the AFI are really talking about our budget. If there are 10,000 people out there who ought to get film grants and we can only give them to 200, obviously we are going to have complaints from the 9,800 who didn't get them. So we have a problem in raising a critical mass of money to do the work we want.

For example, we have an enormous institute in Greystone. When I say enormous, I mean enormous in its accomplishments. But our ability to make an outreach program and spread that information that we are learning and gleaning there throughout the country is very limited because all our outreach programs were not funded.

So we, in the present circumstances, the facts are that, with tremendous strain and tremendous pressure, and cooperation from all parts of the industry—and I mention the industry in here because they

have facilities for raising money—we cannot raise more than one-third of the budget. We would like to, we would like to have more money and we will try to raise money continually, but I see no way on a practical, factual basis of raising more than we are, because we have raised this much money—the amount we have in our prior budget—based on actual effort, a 100-percent effort by the trustees of the board.

So when it comes to the question of fundraising, we have to reach a critical mass and we are not reaching it under the NEA at the moment. They have been very helpful, as a matter of fact, they were the ones who encouraged us to do the National Film Day and we have worked very closely with them over the years.

I think that is enough.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Stevens, did you wish to add anything else?

Let me make just one general observation. Perhaps my perception is not accurate, but on the one hand there has been criticism from people like me that the film industry is such that it ought to give more support to the AFI than it has done. This was a criticism of mine several years ago and I have been encouraged to see that efforts have been made to generate more support particularly along the lines of National Film Day, which really represents support from theater owners as distinguished from industry.

On the other hand, you are getting some criticism, which we heard this morning, to the effect that AFI is too industry oriented, and not sensitive enough, to independent filmmakers. So I have the feeling that there is a tension in the situation, Mr. Stevens, in which you find yourself. This is not an unusual characteristic of life, but is my perception inaccurate or not?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes. And I don't think it is necessarily a bad thing. I think it is a tension that, as this institution grows stronger, will be very important to its health, in that we serve people who are independent film people who have accomplished a great deal, and others who are seeking to.

And we have on our Board people who are representative of the independent filmmakers. I think in the academic community AFI will always be considered too professional and in the professional filmmaking community, we will be considered too academic.

I think it is necessary to bring those elements together. It is a liability and strength.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Peyser, for such questions as he may have.

Mr. PEYSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the testimony and have had an opportunity of reviewing what was said. I have been studying this question of outreach. How do you go out in your organization, in effect, particularly if this becomes an individual program that is funded separately to reach out to the people? Is it part of the program to reach out to young actors and actresses, to reach out to independent producers such as we have here? How do you go about it? I would like to know some of the mechanics involved.

Mr. STEVENS. On the one hand, we reach out to the professional people who receive training and opportunity from the Film Institute. I think because we have witnesses who are coming specifically to talk about that from their own experience, let me speak of it and deal

with something we have not covered in Outreach, which is serving the people across the country who are not professionally involved in films. We have made the point, in fact Mr. Lehman and others on the committee have made the point, that film relates more directly to the people of this country, for better or worse, than any other form of art.

We have an opportunity, we have now created an engine for the American Film Institute which has the archives, a conservatory, the model theater in the Kennedy Center, and publications. We want to use these resources and our professional staff to disseminate both technical and professional information to groups around the country who want to show film.

We have worked, for example, with the Museum in Minneapolis and places in other cities which need technical advice on how to equip a film theater. We had a National Cultural Center built without a film theater. That starts as example A.

So now, having created this resource of professional people—using publications, videotape and through professional advice, we would like to reach outward.

Mr. PEYSER. I would like to come back to this question of Outreach. I do this specifically because the theater, obviously the lifeblood of it is the new people coming up, new actors and actresses, new producers and directors, and I am interested to see if this kind of program is going to move ahead. If it is, I want to know that there is a real total part of this program involving those people in the development of opportunity which, as I understand, is extremely limited today in the field, and very difficult for young people in the industry to find a place for training, and so forth.

Mr. STEVENS. I would say, Mr. Peyser, that is our area of most substantial accomplishment. One is the Conservatory, the Center for Advanced Film Studies where, from all across the country, the most talented professionals are chosen to come and study under the tutelage of the most able and accomplished people from here and abroad.

I had wanted to, Mr. Chairman, with your permission—I will not take time to read the list—ask to be inserted in the record a list of those people who have volunteered their time and given seminars and tutorial help at Greystone. It is an anthology of the most accomplished people in the field. You will hear later from a Terrence Malick, who is from Texas, educated at Harvard University, a Rhodes Scholar, who was one of the first fellows at Greystone. He came there for 2 years of training.

[List referred to appears in Mr. Stevens' prepared statement on p. 59.]

Mr. STEVENS. Last year he directed a film which many people think is the most impressive film of the year, certainly one of the most outstanding, debuts by a young American, called "Badlands." Terrence Malick is here to talk of his experience.

Another is John Hancock, who is also here today. John Hancock is a theater director. He came to the American Film Institute for the opportunity to make the change from theater to film. He received a grant from AFI for making a short film which became an extraordi-

narly artistic success. Short films are never commercially successful, it was "Sticky My Fingers, Fleet My Feet." I wish you could see it.

Based on that film, John received his first opportunity. He directed a film last year which is a wonderful film called "Bang The Drum Slowly," and both John and Terry are examples of the potential of that aspect of the AFI program.

And also to set the stage for our other witnesses, we have a new program which is to train women directors. Opportunities for women have been limited in the main jobs in filmmaking, and with the Rockefeller Foundation we are conducting a program at our conservatory to train women directors.

Maya Angelou and Ellen Burstyn are here to talk about it.

Mr. PEYSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Badillo of New York.

Mr. BADILLO. Included in the group you are seeking to train, have you sought out representatives from the Spanish-speaking communities in the country? They also have great difficulty in finding opportunity.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes. I guess I can deal with particular examples and generalities. We do in our grant program and our selection process at the Center seek out people from minority communities. I can give a number of examples. One particular example happens to be a black man named Oscar Williams. He came to Greystone, studied for 2 years. Last year he made a film "Five On The Black Hand Side." It was a warm and successful comedy.

I think the most responsive answer to that, Mr. Badillo, is that our staff and selection panels are oriented to recognize the void. We are very happy this year because for the first time we have an Indian from the Sioux community in South Dakota as a fellow at the Center. We share your concern.

Mr. BADILLO. You may know, for example, of the Third World Cinema in New York City. We had a lot of trouble getting one film off the ground involving black people, but it has pretty much come to a halt because of the difficulty to provide opportunity for both black and Spanish-speaking people.

I would suggest that you see what you can do to provide more encouragement to those two groups.

Mr. STEVENS. We will, sir, and we would certainly send some information to your office which you might forward to the Third World Cinema and we would encourage their involvement in our organization.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Sarasin.

Mr. SARASIN. No questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Lehman of Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would just ask Mr. Stevens one or two questions quickly before moving on.

Could you give us in perventage terms approximately how much of your budget is devoted to major areas of AFI activity, the Center for Advanced Training Film, cataloging and preservation and any other major activities?

Mr. STEVENS. You want me to just submit that for the record?
Mr. BRADEMAS. Yes; if you could do that.
Mr. STEVENS. I will.
[The information requested follows:]

NOVEMBER 20, 1974.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: During the Subcommittee hearings on October 7 and 8, you requested additional information from the AFI. The attached schedules are in response to your request and provide the following information:

SCHEDULE A

Application of resources by major AFI programs ($3,700,000 budget represents the AFI FY '75 operating budget of $3,350,000 plus $350,000 in additional appropriation funding).

SCHEDULE B

Information as to how AFI would expend $350,000 in additional funds for FY '75.

SCHEDULE C

Comparison of FY '73 through FY '75 AFI generated revenue and NEA funding to clarify the figures submitted as an attachment to Nancy Hanks' testimony. NEA's schedule (included as Schedule D to this letter) implies a declining volume of AFI self-generated funding while depicting a rising NEA funding level. Because NEA has extracted accrued rather than total grant funding, the NEA schedule could be misleading. For example, the NEA schedule does not go beyond FY '73 and as a result does not indicate the substantial AFI generated funding increase in FY '73 FY '75 ($922,000 in '73 to estimated $1,400,000 in '75), while NEA's funding remained basically unchanged. In addition, NEA revenues are not based on the total value of grants given during each fiscal year but represent accrued amounts received during the year. This means that with a contract such as the one for Independent Filmmaker Support where funds are expended over a two year period with the bulk of the funds being expended in the second year, NEA's computation method would indicate a high level of support in the second year even though total funds were actually granted in the preceding year.

If the financial attachment to Nancy Hanks' prepared statement is to be included in the record I hope this clarifying information can be added to prevent further misunderstanding.

If I can assist in answering any additional questions which may have developed since the hearings, please let me know.

With best regards,
Sincerely,

GEORGE STEVENS, JR.

SCHEDULE A.—THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE APPLICATION OF FISCAL YEAR 1975 RESOURCES BY MAJOR PROGRAMS

	Fiscal year 1975 budget	Percentage of budget
1. Public programs	$1,116,396	30
2. Education and training	1,058,196	28
3. Preservation, research and documentation	879,312	24
4. Administrative support	746,096	20
Total	3,700,000	100

Note.—$3,700,000 represents the AFI fiscal year 1975 operating budget of $3,350,000 plus $350,000 in additional appropriation funding.

Schedule B—The American Film Institute Analysis of the Proposed $350,000 Appropriation Increase

Increased funding would permit the AFI to revive and enlarge the scope of its Outreach Program. We have already elicited a lively response from those Museums and commercial theaters to whom we've offered touring programs, information, and technical advice, but have been unable to satisfy the demand or to sustain our earlier initiatives. We need funds (a) to provide information and advice from a centralized information service, nationally accessible through Watts Lines and connected with other centers of film information around the country; (b) to develop touring programs, to make new prints, negotiate rental agreements, and provide informative notes and (c) to offer in-field technical and programming assistance to raise the standards of film presentation on the broadest possible scale $125,000

Reinstate publication of quarterly educational journal, AFI Report 51,000

Project officer and support for TV preservation program 56,000

Provide educational coordination between AFI and educational institutions 60,000

Initiate through Stanford Research Institute or another qualified organization, an independent study of AFI to equate past performance and goals to long range future objectives 34,000

Reinstate program support for activities depleted by budget cuts 24,000

Total 350,000

SCHEDULE C—THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE COMPARISON OF AFI GENERATED REVENUE AND NEA FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 1973-75

	Fiscal year—		
	1973	1974	1975 (budget)
NEA funding	$1,750,000	$1,750,000	$1,781,084
General grant	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Pre-production contract	390,000	300,000	406,084
Independent filmmakers	260,000	260,000	275,000
AFI generated revenue	922,593	1,327,400	1,414,000
Life achievement award	272,185	554,327	540,000
Rockefeller Foundation			35,000
Mayer Foundation	38,110	39,180	50,000
Motion picture companies	75,000	28,915	60,000
National Film Day (fiscal year 1975 estimated)	18,869	87,454	225,000
Jack Valenti	25,000	25,000	50,000
Other revenue	366,555	454,712	329,000
Contributed goods and services	126,874	137,812	125,000

SCHEDULE D

	Fiscal years—					
	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
National Endowment for the Arts	118,140	706,692	975,168	916,667	1,268,510	1,740,149
National Endowment for the Humanities					61,576	263,136
Ford Foundation	134,139	675,728	466,113	400,000	400,000	
Motion Picture Association of America	217,000	524,805	558,195	155,000	83,500	
Self-generated	728	7,718	98,113	238,259	233,470	151,080
Other	82,423	418,228	498,683	531,500	798,491	644,639
Goods, services		60,867	357,797	315,148	188,110	126,874

[1] Includes grants and contracts.

[2] In fiscal 1973 (issued by John Ford Award, $25,000 contributed by Columbia Broadcasting System, $18,869 generated from Film Day, $22,900 from American Broadcasting Co., and $17,100 from Academy of Motion Pictures.

Source: Figures quoted directly above are from the American Film Institute's financial statements as of the closing dates June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I wonder also if you could give us a brief report on the American Film Institute Theater at the Kennedy Center, and on the cataloging of American films, and film preservation.

Mr. STEVENS. What do you want, sir?

Mr. BRADEMAS. If you could just give us a very brief comment on how you see the AFI doing in those three areas.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes; we have successfully created a model national film theater in the Kennedy Center and its purpose is not simply to serve those people who can come to the Kennedy Center but, by the example of the programming in which we show a different film every night throughout the year, to provide an example to other communities around the country who seek to have the highest quality film programming in their particular area.

This Center was built by contributions to the AFI and was not out of our government grant money.

One thing I would like to mention, Mr. Chairman, you asked me the kind of things we would do with new programs and what the results of our constrictive budget has been. This year we are spending only $7,700 on the problem of looking into and organizing the solution for the television archival program. That would be one area where we would spend more money if more money became available.

The other area would be the services to the regional theaters, the technical advice and programming advice which I just referred to.

Third would be in the publications area. One of our more impressive activities was this publication "AFI Report," which is a quarterly. Because we have had no increase in our Federal funding over the last 3 years, and because of the fight against inflation, something had to go, and that publication has had to be suspended. We want to, and would, resume that were we to have fuller funding. You asked for that yesterday.

I have a report on that which I would also like to submit to you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Lehman has one more question.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is a problem that is a little bit worrisome to me. Mr. Brandt suggests that the resources the motion picture industry applies to the AFI to produce the kind of experimental, innovative creative films would be certainly an important goal of the AFI.

But how do you get those kinds of films into your commercial theaters? You have a commitment to fund these people but do you have a commitment to expose their product in the commercial field?

Mr. BRANDT. That is a very complex problem which we are trying to resolve in various ways. Theaters would be pleased to show films that are made by AFI students or grantees. The problem is dollars. To distribute a film is a very costly thing, just in the making of prints. The number of prints that have to be made to get any major distribution is substantial, and since the films that are generally made by the fellows or by grantees are, to some extent, sometimes avant-garde, a little ahead of what the public is actually ready for, it is a bit difficult to get this into the commercial stream.

However, there are other ways of doing it. One is through television, the educational stations, another is through 16 millimeter distribution, and we have arrangements for that.

And there is a constant pressure on the commercial aspects of the industry to support the AFI not only in the dollar way but also in the public relations way.

One of the problems with this bill—and the only one I envisage—is the fact that there won't be 35 or 40 participants from the private sector on the board of trustees. The more people we can get from all portions of the educational field, from the creative field, from the industry field, from actors, and the more participation we can have in responsible positions—and responsible positions means as trustees—the more we are going to be able to get this spread.

I am somewhat concerned about the limited number of directors on the total board of trustees, as suggested in the bill. That is my only criticism but we are working on that.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think, as you indicated, it must be a two-way street as there are more people in this country writing poetry than reading it. I wouldn't want to see more people producing film than seeing it.

Mr. STEVENS. I don't think we are anywhere near that.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, gentlemen. We appreciate your thoughtful testimony.

Next we look forward to hearing Miss Maya Angelou and Miss Ellen Burstyn.

We are pleased to have both such distinguished artists with us this morning.

Ladies, proceed as you wish.

A PANEL CONSISTING OF MAYA ANGELOU, WRITER, POET, AND FILMMAKER; ELLEN BURSTYN, ACTRESS; AFI WOMEN'S WORKSHOP

Miss ANGELOU. My name is Maya Angelou. I am a writer. I write books and it has so developed upon me to be the first black woman to write a Hollywood film which was done in Sweden 2 years ago; it was "Georgia, Georgia." It was a Cinerama distribution.

While I was there at the Swedish Film Institute I took a course in cinematography, and they did a week of films directed by women.

I sat there 1 week and watched and there was not one film by an American woman.

I am a director of film, whether we like it or not, or admit it or not, and I have wanted to direct film, I suppose, since I saw Shirley Temple—then Temple. I knew I could do it. I could have directed "Georgia, Georgia," but I was a woman, after all. I wrote it, it is true. And I wrote the music, it is true. But I was a woman. The American Film Institute contacted me a few months ago and said I had been selected as one of the 19 women to take a course in film direction. It is true there is one woman in the United States who can say she is a film director, that is the way she makes her living, as a film director. So when I look at the 19 women with whom I am working at the Film Institute, it is as embarrassing as seeing a group of blacks whose credits, whose qualifications are so vast that they are embarrassing.

The women are outstanding, and yet none of us have had a chance to hold the very filmmaking instruments, which is important. It is an industry after all, and to hold those expensive cameras and to edit, use the editing machine—we might be great artists and cute in the kitchen, but we have not had the chance before. We are all very, very excited, especially about the women's program at AFI.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you.

Miss Burstyn?

Miss BURSTYN. First I would like to say when these young men (in the hearing room) were making the tape I asked if they were with us, with the AFI. I was told "no." And I asked why wasn't someone from AFI here to photograph it, and they said there weren't enough funds to have a crew here.

The American Film Institute contacted me along with, I think, about 50 other women asking us if we would be interested in a work with the AFI. I was told "no." And I asked why wasn't someone from women was overwhelming, and that they are going to have to continue with a second group because everybody they contacted who were women in the industry but not directors, all wanted to take part in the workshop. Nineteen were selected, and I was very grateful they selected me.

The other women in the workshop, some are actresses, some writers, editors, producers. One of the women is an executive at Columbia Studios. The studios have been not too reluctant to employ women in most jobs except directing. That has been one field where they have been very reluctant to employ women. So it is an opportunity that Hollywood has never offered women before either in an organized way or individually. As Maya said, we have one woman director and that is all.

The program works in this way: Each woman is given the opportunity to make a film. The suggested time is 20 minutes, although that is not rigid. We are allowed to select our own material, we are given a fellow—a student at the Institute who has already made one or two films and been through the process himself—to be our assistant, production assistant, so he gets what we need.

But we are given full rein to shoot the film ourselves. We each turned in our scripts, so the project was OK'd, but they are not censoring, but just making sure that we are not trying to do more than we can.

The people at the institute have been completely supportive. There is no other way to learn how to shoot a film except to shoot a film. You can't exactly sit around and talk about it and know how to do it.

I am now in the process—I will begin shooting—on Thursday. I have been in rehearsal for 2 weeks and have gone to all the locations and gone through the training that AFI provided with the editing and the camera and so forth. Now I am ready to shoot. I delayed my shooting 2 days to come here and speak in favor of this bill because I think that the American Film Institute is providing something that should be encouraged to continue.

By the way, the people who are fellows at the institute, the grantees, the students, are not industry people, they are kids.

You know, I have a feeling we are all a little too well dressed here, giving the impression that we are all industry people who don't really need help.

I urge that you pass this bill. I think the American Institute is doing all it can to help young filmmakers and it is greatly needed.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank both of you.

I take it the obvious conclusion to derive from your testimony is that you feel at least the AFI is helping open some doors that have hitherto been locked, particularly for women in directing films. That is the principal reason for your testimony here today.

Miss BURSTYN. And also to be able to go through the process of directing a film without it costing $1 million.

I think we have a budget of around $200. But all the equipment and the crew is provided and you can't get that anywhere else.

Miss ANGELOU. I also think this program outreach, the program itself, in order to have an effective outreach into Spanish speaking people's communities, into women's communities, young people and blacks, so it would be necessary next year—we are already set for 1 year—but it is necessary next year to be able to enlarge that program and instead of 19 women, be able to accommodate 38 women, and also other minorities.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I didn't think women were in the minority in this country. There are more women registered to vote in the State of Indiana than there are men. I know that.

Miss BURSTYN. You would know that.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Peyser.

Mr. PEYSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to welcome both of you here. I was interested in what you had to say. In this particular industry I have a brother who for a long time has been a director on the west coast, and I have a daughter who is a struggling young actress in New York City. So I hear the complaints and problems in several different areas. But I am interested in this outreach problem again because my real concern, one of the primary things I will be interested in is to see, even at high school level, how are we reaching people to let them know here is a potential industry in art form.

How do we help them? Are we doing anything to help them?

You mentioned outreach. What is the process you go through?

Miss BURSTYN. As a case in point, there is a young woman in San Francisco, Gerri Lang, who has a brilliant son, the star of "Hair." When that folded what was he to do? A young black man who just was bright. Would he really stay with it, struggle in the theater? He wanted to be more than just an actor. As it turned out—his brother and I are friends—I walked into AFI and there he was. How AFI got in touch with him and possibly saved him not only for himself but saved him for the country, to society, the country, I don't know. He is a brilliant young man. So obviously they are reaching.

I think with the funding that is direct, that is substantial, that kind of reach could include more people. We lose too many.

I think probably what should be very clear is that, if an organization is funded by the Government, it should have a very specific program for reaching out.

Mr. PEYSER. I think this, to me, is one of the keys. In the national endowments, for example, in my own district there is an organization known as the LOFT. The LOFT is an original little place, but they reach out into the community and are training young children in acting and taking part. The two communities involved happen to be Bronxville and Tuckahoe, N.Y., which happens to be its neighbor, but very much on the other side of the economic scale. And the LOFT reached out, it is headquartered in Bronxville, run by some very young, very talented people, and they now have really got something going and the endowment thought enough of this to put some money into this program and they have been blossoming forth into a great community type thing where young people are learning these skills.

I would like to think this type of program would also be looking to reach out in this way. This is really, as I say, one of my concerns.

The other objectives are certainly essential and a key part of the whole program. Now to me this is the lifeblood of the future, to see this happen, and I am just appreciative of your feeling that that is going on, and is what is going to be happening.

Miss BURSTYN. I think somebody from the Institute could answer that better than I. We are on the receiving end, not the giving end, at the moment.

Mr. PEYSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Badillo.

Mr. BADILLO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank you for your testimony not only because it affects the passage of this bill but I think more importantly, because it affects another committee we have which has to do with the question of equal employment opportunity and I think Mr. Hawkins would be the chairman of that committee.

Perhaps a copy of this testimony could be referred to him because unfortunately, too often in Congress we have so many different committees that we don't tie in the testimony in one piece of legislation to the other. And I think it would be important to inquire as to why it is that there is only one woman director in the whole of the American cinema industry.

I would like to ask, is the same thing true with respect to television production?

Miss ANGELOU. One does find a few women directors. There are women who write television scripts but even so the prejudice is endemic. One could talk about it until one weeps.

I think in this case this is why the AFI project is so very important because it does, it gives us, women, the same chances it gives the men directors in their program. We are not fawned upon, we are not petted and pampered. We are trained and we are expected to come up with a piece of material.

So, for the first time one isn't being treated either as, you know, a little darling, nor is one ignored—and it is just amazing.

I have come here from California just to talk.

Mr. BADILLO. The program has just begun; this is the first group?

Miss BURSTYN. Yes, three women are presently shooting and will show their films on October 19 to all the other women in the group for criticism and praise and as an exchange of experience.

Mr. BADILLO. It would be useful to us, I think, over the years, if we could get some reports as time goes by as to what happens to those people.

Miss ANGELOU. I don't think that will be a problem. I just expect in 2 years you will say, "Oh, yes, I remember her."

Mr. BADILLO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Sarasin.

Mr. SARASIN. Thank you and again, I would like to thank the young women for their testimony here this morning.

I have several questions. Perhaps the one that struck me first is why a separate course for women?

Miss ANGELOU. Yes, one of our fellows asked that as we came in this morning and said that that really shows some sort of discrimination.

You know, there is so much catching up to be done, and that is one reason. It would seem to me, if people have been left out of the mainstream and have to be brought in, then there ought to be a kind of

concentration of energy then upon that group so that there may hopefully come a time in 2 or 3 years when there is simply a directors workshop.

When 100 women have been trained, then that is fine, but at this time we need concern, direct concern for our lacks.

Miss BUSEBYS. Jan Haag at the institute thought of having a women's group. Her thinking and sending letters out brought it to the attention of the women for the first time. If there are no women directors, it is not considered a job that is open. There were a lot of women that had not considered being a director and, when they got the letter asking if they were interested, they realized they were. It is kind of unique that there can be such a thing as a woman director.

Mr. SARASIN. Would it be considered on that basis as a separate course for women or would there be a blending?

Miss ANGELOU. One hopes not. One would think it would be like a civil rights thing. One hopes to work one's self out of a job. One hopes it will not be necessary in time, but at this time it is necessary.

Mr. BADILLO. Will the gentleman yield?

I don't know whether they thought of it, but it seems they might qualify under some of the other legislation we have passed in the Congress. This does exactly the kind of thing that we have been trying to do in the universities and in other areas of our economy. I think if you were to look into it you might find that could be a source of funding which would supplement whatever we get out of this committee.

I thank that gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SARASIN. I thank Mr. Badillo for his comments.

How many men have participated in this course? I understand there are 19 women.

Miss ANGELOU. I would ask that you ask someone else. I don't know.

Mr. SARASIN. May I ask what opportunities there would be for placement in a situation like this? Obviously, we are talking here to a very distinguished authority and distinguished actress.

You are not looking for a job when you get through with this course?

Miss ANGELOU. Exactly that. For 2 years I have had a script of a book of mine which is very popular. I want to direct it. I have been asked and seduced by large corporations, film corporations, attempted seduction into giving up my film to a man director and probably a white male director and I said absolutely not. Because of this, almost directly because of the AFI program, I am now going to direct my film in the spring and so I will be the first black woman to direct a Hollywood film.

It isn't because there weren't black women before who were much more qualified, fantastic directors off Broadway who were ready to do film but I am in the AFI program and that means the American Film Institute believes in me, and that also means in case—hopefully—we are funded directly, that also the Government in a very indirect way believes in me.

When I talked to the producer and said I am an AFI, he said I think I can get all the money. It happened to Lee Grant, who is an actress and a director. She has not been able to get money. She has not shot her film, but it was announced she was in AFI and she got a job as a television director.

Mr. SARASIN. As I understood your statements before you were talking of children in the program, a number of young people. This is their first exposure and hopefully they will go on to something bigger and better. Is there opportunity for them in the motion picture industry, in television, so that they can go on to something else, or are they just spending a great deal of time learning a trade which they will never be able to use?

Miss BUCKLEY. I think Mr. Hancock and others who have taken part in the industry are testimony to that. I don't have the list of people graduating from AFI that have gone on to be part of the industry. There are lots of them.

Mr. SARASIN. Thank you very much for your testimony here this morning.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. It has been a privilege to have you here today and especially gratifying as the night before last, "The Last Picture Show" was on television.

I think of AFI as being certainly a lot more acceptable to me when it receives support from people like you. At this time I don't think we should turn this into a great debate, but certainly not only in the film industry, but throughout the country we waste a great deal of our most valuable resources in the creativity and productivity and possibility of a great many women in our country.

I was wondering, without picking on Mr. Brandt, whether he has a training program for women theater managers to show the films?

Mr. BRANDT. We have lots of women in the theaters.

Mr. LEHMAN. Out of the basket of male chauvinism, such as the automobile industry, I can see the problems you have in your industry, but those are problems we must overcome in the automobile industry as well as the film industry to get this show on the road again.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much. We are grateful to you for taking time to be with us today.

Good luck on your films.

Next, we shall hear from a panel of three filmmakers.

The Chair would observe that time is again running out on us and we have several other witnesses. So, if our next three witnesses, Mr. Hancock, Mr. Malick, and Mr. Emshwiller will summarize as succinctly as they can their views, we will be very grateful to them.

Who wishes to begin?

STATEMENTS OF JOHN HANCOCK, AFI INDEPENDENT FILMMAKER; TERRENCE MALICK, FORMER AFI FELLOW; AND ED EMSHWILLER, INDEPENDENT FILMMAKER

Mr. BRADEMAS. Please identify yourselves for the record.

Mr. HANCOCK. My name is John Hancock. My statement is very brief and personal because if it were not for the American Film Institute, I would not be making films.

I worked in the theater for 10 years and really lusted after filmmaking during that period. I bought a book, "The End of the Road," and tried for 2 years, gave 2 years of my life to try to get a movie out of it, unsuccessfully. I was quite successful in the theater. I directed

of Broadway hits. I had run a theater in San Francisco and Pittsburgh, so I think I was really qualified to make a movie, but the industry is in a way terribly hard to break into.

I then received a grant from the American Film Institute and made this film George Stevens spoke of, "Sticky my Fingers, Fleet my Feet." It was nominated for an Academy Award and out of that I got two feature films and they came about as a direct result of that film, in that the producers saw this short and called me and asked if I would be interested in doing their product.

I have observed not only my own experience but that of others. I think, too, in addition to having just two jobs, the learning experience of making that short was crucial. I kind of tremble to think what would have happened had I been able to go ahead and make that "End of the Road" project before I really learned how to make a film.

The chance in a kind of low-budget way to learn and reshoot and fail and eventually pull it into shape would not have been permitted on a feature. I think I would probably have been replaced rather quickly.

So, to me this is a very valuable institution and I hope that you can get this legislation passed.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

Mr. MALICK. I am Terrence Malick. I attended the AFI studies in Los Angeles in 1969, graduated in 1971 and have since been working professionally in the movies as a writer and director. I can state categorically that were it not for the training that I received at the center, this direction would not have been possible for me, nor could any other school really have replaced the institute and the service it provided.

Other schools can demonstrate how to make films or feature films in some best of all possible worlds, but I believe the institute alone exposes one to the realities of feature movie making in this country and in this particular difficult time.

I guess that is all.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Emshwiller.

STATEMENT OF ED EMSHWILLER, INDEPENDENT FILM MAKER

Mr. EMSHWILLER. I would like to take a minute to tell you about myself before discussing the proposed legislation concerning the AFI because it should help to define my perspective.

I am an independent film maker, one of those not involved in the film industry; one referred to at times as experimental, underground, avant garde. I am one of hundreds of film makers who make nontheatrical, personal films shown largely at universities, museums and film societies, and occasionally on public TV, film makers who make films out of a commitment to an artistic or social vision rather than as a product for mass consumption.

In addition to making a number of such films and videotapes, I have been involved in several organizations which are composed of independent film makers or which can help them in some way. I am on the board of directors of both the Film Makers Cooperative, and the Association of Independent Video and Film Makers. I am on the advisory panels for the University Film Study Center, and the media

sections of both the New York State Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts. I have also been a member of the board of trustees of the American Film Institute for over 5 years.

I originally accepted the invitation to join the board of the AFI largely because I thought the system for giving grants to independent film makers needed improvement, and I hoped I might help change it. After 4 years the program did change and, to my mind, improved.

At this point the AFI has a solid independent film maker program, especially since the NEA established a separate contract with them increasing the amount awarded. Something which the AFI board did not do on its own. Not that the program couldn't be further improved, but it now does provide artistic freedom and funding for 20 to 30 film makers a year, and a number of very good films have come from it. I want specifically to mention the films Watersmith, Ice, Quick Billy, and Razor Blades, Porch Glider, and Cycles as works of art or social comment. It is films like these that open your mind to unconventional visions. They are far more exciting to me than any standard entertainment film and are important in developing new awarenesses. I believe more of them should be nurtured.

I am assuming we all agree that art is good, that art has value for society in enriching, interpreting and criticising the culture. Artists care more about making art than making money. To my mind grants exist to help those who are not preoccupied with making money and who need help to pursue their art.

Pauline Kael wrote an interesting article that appeared in the August 5 issue of the New Yorker. I recommend it to you. In it she noted the inherent conflict between businessmen and artists in Hollywood. I would not like to see the AFI run like a Hollywood studio (as portrayed in her article). Money and power must not be the values of primary concern in the AFI. In its present financial bind, the AFI has loaded its board with people who are experts in those fields and during the past few years most of the board's energy has been spent on how to survive economically. I would hope that if money and power are supplied by Congress, the AFI leadership could concern itself more with the art of film and how it might be served.

The AFI board, presently dominated by executives from the film industry, gives the lion's share of the AFI budget (other than administrative overhead) to the film school at Greystone, a trade school and, admittedly, a good one. The school is geared to prepare people to enter the entertainment film industry. That may be good for the industry, but I doubt it is the best way to funnel most of the taxpayer's money in support of the art of film. Should we also fund a trade school in literature, teaching students how to write best sellers and ignore teaching poetry?

As long as AFI policy is in the hands of Hollywood businessmen whose jobs demand skill in making money, not art, I believe the AFI cannot and should not represent the field.

As I understand the proposed legislation, 12 of the 23 trustees would be appointed from the film world and the others would be from the Government. I hope that the people who would have the major role in setting policy would be the film people since they know the field best and would help inform those from Government.

But it would be unfortunate if the theatrical film and television

industry was the only voice representing film. If the AFI is not to be dominated exclusively by one segment of the field, the legislation must require that others professionally concerned be part of the policy-making body. I have been led to believe that, as presently conceived, there will not be room for independent film makers on the new board. I think that at least one-half of the film representatives on the board must be non-Hollywood. By that I mean there should not only be representatives from nontheatrical film making, but also representatives from university film education, from film criticism, and from regional film centers. Preferably these would be selected by their colleagues rather than a self-appointed selection committee of the AFI board. Only with such broad representation on the policymaking board do I feel the AFI will reflect and attend to the diversity of needs in the field.

I see the AFI as an organization with great potential to serve the art of film and nurture talent, given adequate financing and a broad representation in policymaking, but even so I would not like to see it assume total responsibility for the disbursement of government funds in film making. The NEA, the NEH, the USOE, among others, support different kinds of film programs. The National Endowment in the Arts, particularly, has supported film making and film-related institutions, and I think should continue to do so. Their program complements and augments the AFI efforts. As a result, people with proposals in need of support have more than one place to go, and that is very important. If there is only one source of funds, it is, in effect, a monopoly, causing de facto censorship. There must not be centralization, but rather diversity of vision in support of the arts.

Finally, if the concerns and cautions I have expressed about the AFI are taken into consideration, if, that is, the legislation guarantees the full participation of a cross section of all concerned in AFI policy-making, and if the Government is prohibited from interfering with the artistic freedom of those receiving grants, and if the AFI does not manage all government film activity, then, and only then, I would ask you to support such a bill. Otherwise, not.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

I might just make a couple of points in respect, Mr. Enshwiller, to what you have just observed.

With respect to the last paragraph of your statement wherein you remark on who manages government film activity, I believe a few months ago our colleague, Mr. Goldwater, Jr., of California, announced a survey that he had instigated of film making in the Federal Government, and it is really quite extraordinary.

Without going through the entire list, I can tell you that there is enormous diversity of support, from several Federal departments, for film making. I realize that the phrase "government film activity," is an ambiguous one, but I wanted to get that on the record, and also to indicate my agreement with you on your point of the diversity of film making so far as Federal funds are concerned.

We have had a number of telegrams here which have apparently been produced, on the basis of erroneous information, or possibly a total misunderstanding of the bill under consideration. Some of the telegrams suggest that the purpose of the bill is to remove some of the several programs for film making supported by the National Endowment of the Arts.

That is not the case, and I think it is necessary to get this on the record. No one is proposing such a removal, and I want to tell all within the sound of my voice who are concerned and may have criticism of the bill, that they are very welcome to criticize, but I hope whatever criticisms that come forth are, to the extent humanly possible, based on more accurate information.

I would just put one question to you and invite any of you or each of you to make a comment if you wish.

You have heard criticism from other witnesses about the work of the AFI in supporting independent film making. All three of you began as independent film makers and some of you still find yourselves in that situation.

Could you comment on the validity of the criticism we have heard?

Mr. HANCOCK. I think you touched on the problem earlier when you discussed if the AFI is trying to bring together conflicting interests.

Certainly this is a valid argument to be made that it should concern the mainstream of American film, film seen all over the country, some profitably. And I think also a valid case is to be made for funding much more experimental work. There is obviously not enough money to do both to everybody's satisfaction. I don't think you will please everybody in this; I see no way.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I must say I am sympathetic with the point of view you have expressed, and as I heard your statements and recalled those of some of the earlier witnesses, I reflected upon some of the controversy on this committee when we wrote the OEO legislation, the poverty legislation, years ago. There, too, we had a continuing and I think healthy debate about the appropriate power to be given to the poor and to politicians at the local level, the State level, and the Federal level when money was scarce and everybody wanted to be sure that he or she had a piece of the decisionmaking action.

And we are also concerned on this committee with legislation that would support museums and, if anybody thinks that museums are without political implications, then he hasn't talked to many people in the museum world because some of the same criticisms voiced here today are very analogous to some of the problems we run into in that world.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Peyser.

Mr. PEYSER. No questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. No questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Sarasin.

Mr. SARASIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have several questions that perhaps might generate some more questions.

First, Mr. Hancock, you talked about receiving a grant from the AFI which enabled you to make the transition from theater to film-making. May I ask the value of that grant?

Mr. HANCOCK. $10,000.

Mr. SARASIN. Could you tell me what you do with $10,000 when you try to put a film together? It would seem to me that is not enough money to do very much. How did you utilize that money?

Mr. HANCOCK. You are right, it's not enough. It provided the trigger that enabled me to raise an equal amount from other people. So I made my film on schedule. I could have made a shorter film on that amount. It just happened that the subject I chose was too long to accomplish in that amount of time. Perhaps other people with greater access to equipment than I have could have made an even longer film on $10,000. But because of the cut-off on recession, however, I was not able.

I did not go for salaries, it went for equipment and film and editing. It was concretely spent. It was not spent on me or on people.

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Dashwiller, the concern that you have expressed on the behalf of the board, as expressed to us here yesterday, is that excessive interjection could quite possibly result in too much government control, government censorship or government propaganda could be the result of it.

Now you are concerned about too much Hollywood influence.

It occurs to me someone has got to control this, and when we are looking at the situation, when there is not enough money to do all the things we would like to do, someone must control or the Congress very quickly will be turned off. I come back to the argument that took place on the floor during the funding of a National Endowment when there were attempts to kill the whole program.

A classical example of a wasted one, the poem "Lighght"—and that is not the title, and it was the result of a $5,000 grant. It's the kind of example that would be used by the critics to "Lighght."

Mr. DASHWILLER. I think my answer would be that, although the film industry is a very successful industry, it is an industry, and it has supported and probably should support its own training program.

Whether the Government should do that as well, I am not sure. That the Government should support art, I am convinced. I think the support the industry makes in art whose function is to make money, not art, is questionable.

Mr. SARASIN. Should there be some recapture of funds here or at least some attempt to provide enough commercial film, in the sense of profit-making, to help cover the program going?

Mr. DASHWILLER. A film school, is that what you are speaking of? I think the gents who are most concerned with that could answer it. I think my own sense of it is the industry should support its own school.

Mr. HANCOCK. There was an attempt to recapture the potential income from the shorts made under the independent grants and it proved a very negative influence on the entire program.

First of all, there is almost no income from shorts to speak of. And, it was a source of dissatisfaction and I think some of the hostility felt by independent filmmakers stems directly from that attempt and very wisely the American Film Institute has abandoned that.

Now, the filmmaker can keep whatever income there is because it stirred up so much trouble.

Mr. SARASIN. I wonder if the panel could comment on the situation at Greystone. I am not familiar with it but there was discussion of this situation yesterday concerning the problems within the school itself and I wonder if any of you have anything to add to that?

Mr. MARICK. I am not familiar with recent problems. But, the 2 years I was there, there were problems but not nearly as many as I

experienced as an academic, as a teacher at a university prior to my coming to the AFI. So, I am saying in effect that these problems and disagreements are inevitable and that they should be looked upon as a sign of health not as in any way discrediting the institution.

Mr. SARASIN. Do you feel the opportunities for young people—and it is expressed here there are a number of very young people involved in these programs—do you feel there are sufficient opportunities for them once they go through this process in the field for employment?

Mr. EMSHWILLER. I am sorry, I was distracted.

Mr. MAYER. No, I mean—even if you get out of this school and have all these skills, there is a problem that is the problem of movies in this country today that it is difficult, they are having problems turning a profit and, unless they turn a profit, it is difficult to find people who are ready to keep putting up money for them.

So I think, in all frankness, you know one has to answer that even coming out of the AFI you face a very hard struggle.

Mr. SARASIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, gents. Your testimony has been most illuminating.

Next we shall hear from Mr. Roger Stevens, Director of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Mr. Stevens, you are an old friend of this committee and we welcome you back under a new hat.

STATEMENT OF ROGER STEVENS, DIRECTOR, JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. STEVENS. Thank you.

I have a brief statement here, Mr. Chairman, which, with your permission, I will read.

Mr. Chairman, I am Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and former chairman of the National Council on the Arts.

I rise in favor of H.R. 17691, dated October 2, 1974. While I was chairman of the Arts Council, one of the most important issues raised was the first council meetings was the lack of a film institute in this country. The council authorized Stanford Research Institute to make a study in depth of the needs of such an institute. The results of this study have already been referred to by other witnesses, so I will not duplicate their testimony.

As a result, the council authorized $1,300,000 for 3 years after the Ford Foundation had agreed to a matching grant of an equal amount. The Motion Picture Association also agreed to an equal contribution. The rest of the money came for miscellaneous gifts. Thus, with the enthusiastic approval of the council, a board was chosen, and the institute was assured of a minimum income of $1,300,000 per year. This grant represented a substantial portion of our budget and was one of the largest single grants given.

I do feel, however, that the American Film Institute is quite different from any other organizations which receive support from the National Council on the Arts. It is a separate organization which must maintain a substantial staff if it is to act as a truly national service organization which will allow the United States to compete favor-

ably in the international film world. I feel the time has come when the AFI should receive the type of funding called for in this legislation—two thirds from the Government and one third from private sources.

One of the main reasons for supporting a film institute was the fact that the nature of the industry was such that it was very difficult for talented young people to get the kind of training necessary to become successful professional directors, writers, cameramen, producers, et cetera, and make a living of their chosen craft. This problem, unfortunately, is faced by all artists today in every field.

After leaving the Arts Council, I served as chairman of the American Film Institute for several years and was able to observe its operation firsthand. I sincerely believe that great strides were made in helping potential talent get started, as is evidenced by the number of graduates that have already become successful in the film world.

One of the most important assets has been the leadership of the board. I have served on many boards, but never have I seen such dedication as has been given by the leaders in motion pictures, television, and theater ownership—whose time is at such a premium—to insure the success of the institute. The achievements of the board over a period of time are self evident, so I will not single out any one director. The important point is that the makeup of the board in the past has been so outstanding that Congress can be assured that any authority or funds given to the AFI will be in very capable hands.

The leadership of George Stevens, Jr., through the many difficulties involved in starting an organization and administering it during those troubled times, has been exceptional. He has enjoyed the backing of the many outstanding professionals on his board.

I feel we must do all we can to encourage and develop the great creative talent we have in this country in order that the United States may maintain its role as world leader in the field of film; and I also feel that we should make every effort to assist an industry which brings hundreds of millions in foreign exchange to this country.

I heartily recommend to Congress that H.R. 17021 be enacted as soon as possible, as I think the American Film Institute has reached a point where it deserves individual recognition.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Stevens.

Mr. Stevens, you may know that yesterday during our hearings, Miss Hanks, your successor as chairman of the Arts Endowment, and your namesake, though not kin, George Stevens, Jr., both expressed agreement that the activities both of the AFI and the Public Media Program for Endowment should be continued. And, I wonder if, given your own experience as the first chairman of the Endowment, you could give us any comment you may wish on the history of the AFI on the one hand, and the history of the Public Media Program on the other, so that we would get a clearer perception of the relationship between the two?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, as you remember, we started with rather limited funds so we sort of arbitrarily divided up how the money should be spent between the various art forms and we estimated it somewhere between 10 and 12 percent of our funds should go to the Public Media and the films.

So, all of our money, even then, was not used for the Film Insti-

tute. And I think it is very important that the National Endowment for the Arts continue to make grants, especially in the field that Mr. Enslwiller was talking about.

I also think it is equally important that this country give the young filmmakers and those that want to become producers and directors and the like a chance to show that their talents are worthy of consideration. I don't think it all devolves to the Hollywood professional films that everyone keeps harping on. There are many dedicated people doing films in the so-called Hollywood industry that feel they are just as much producing art as the next one. I think that you will find the leading, the ones that had the greatest success, are every bit as much an artist as someone that wants to take a different tack. I don't think that because a man writes a best seller that the best seller is worthless.

Going back to Dickens, Balzac, and the like, they were writing successful novels and they are still successful, and I don't see that our films made over the world, they are part of a great body that made commercial films successful. I don't think just because something is successful commercially that it should bear a stigma.

Mr. Brademas. On the matter of composition of the board as set forth in the proposed bill, you know there are 23 members contemplated, 12 private and 11 public. Do you have any general comment on that arrangement or any suggestions for modifying it in any way?

Mr. Stevens. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to state that I have been connected now in various forms with the Government for 10 years in the arts and I think it is to the credit of the House and the Senate that never once have I been asked not to do something on the part of the Congress and the complete freedom that has been offered has been remarkable.

As you recall in the early hearings on the Arts Council, there was great fear that the Government was going to dominate everything. I think the Government has been very cooperative, at least as far as my experience is concerned, and has allowed freedom. And also, as you know, on the Kennedy Center Board we have a number of Government officials. I think we have 15 to 30 in that case and they have been a great help and never interfered with our policy whatsoever.

I think any fears that the ex officio officials will bring the heavy hand of Government are groundless. It hasn't happened now although it could happen in the future. I do think that the other members should be from various fields. I think everyone involved, education and private filmmakers, should have their representatives, but I don't think there has to be any real fears.

My problem is getting everyone to work. I think we have had a great deal of time and energy devoted from all fields. Mr. Enslwiller has worked very hard and I don't see any problems as long as you can secure the caliber of people that are there now.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you.

Mr. Sarbin.

Mr. Sarbin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have no questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. One other question. I don't know whether you have given particular attention or not to copyright questions, but I have a question relating to the preservation of early television film. I think that CBS and Indiana University have been in a dispute whether that university can legally maintain archives of television news. Have you got into that whole area at all? I know you are a very busy man; this may not be an area in which you have plunged.

Mr. STEVENS. I am afraid I would not be qualified to get into that. I do think, as has been stated before, with the help of the Arts Council and the Library of Congress, for the preservation of old films, maintaining proper archives has been one of the great accomplishments that the Archives and the Film Institute have been able to do.

Mr. BRADEMAS. This goes back to the whole matter of justification for public support of a national film institute, particularly as one looks at the experience in other countries, including Canada and Sweden, with which, in all candor, I am not very familiar.

Mr. STEVENS. In the first place, I have traveled in most of the countries where film institutes exist, especially behind the Iron Curtain where they are part of government activity and I know it has been mentioned that the film industry should do more. When we started the film industry was not giving support to a movement of this kind and, while the particular and peculiar way the film industry has to operate, it is hard to get them to put the support up and I think, as a Nation that has created really the great interest in films, that we should see that our younger people get the right training.

And I think, Mr. Chairman, if we support the Film Institute that it will be very beneficial to our country and I think we have to do it in terms of the competition from other countries and that is the reason why we basically started it. As some of my colleagues and, I think as President Ford said the other night at the Arts Council meeting, he was a converted follower of the arts today.

I think I have been a converted follower of the films, because George Stevens and I, at the beginning of the Kennedy Center days, had a few discussions and I say I am a converted film supporter.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you. We appreciate your taking the time to come and speak to us.

Finally this morning, we have a panel of educators, Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Perry, Mr. Mallery, and Mr. Nye.

Would you come forward, gentlemen?

The House goes into session at noon and we can continue until there is a quorum call.

If you would be kind enough to summarize your views as succinctly as possible, that would be helpful because of the time bind we are in, and would give Mr. Sarasin and me a chance to put some questions. But your entire statements, if prepared, will be included in the hearing record.

Would you identify yourselves and perhaps you would like to speak in the order I read your names: Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Perry, Mr. Mallery, and Mr. Nye.

STATEMENT OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF GERALD O'GRADY, DIRECTOR OF MEDIA STUDIES, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK; TED PERRY, PROFESSOR AND CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF CINEMA STUDY, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY; DAVID MALLERY, DIRECTOR OF STUDIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS, PHILADELPHIA, PA.; AND RUSSEL B. NYE, PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. O'Grady. I am somewhat disappointed, this being an educational panel, that we are not getting enough time. I think [illegible]

Mr. Brademas. I can sit here as long as I can; is that fair enough?

Mr. O'Grady. Thank you.

I am director of the Media Center at the State University of New York at Buffalo, and director of the Instruction Center there. I am also director of the Media Study which is the regional organization.

I think that the committee probably should be aware that the field of education does not feel that there has been sufficient consultation in the formation of the American Film Institute. I think they feel that the board is not sufficiently representative of their interests.

I think that the proportion of the budget—it is my understanding that most of the originals, about $8 million spent since 1967 and 1971, $1½ was spent on education, some 3 percent. In the 1974 budget, roughly $3½ million, I think $61,000 was spent for education, or 2 percent.

I am aware that the Senators are concerned and I think it is important to note that the membership of the American Film Institute is somewhere of which 1,000 are in the Washington area, despite a considerable undersubscription, I think, in 1973.

The director of education, James Kitses, was fired in 1971, and at that point I think it should be entered into the record an important essay written by Richard Thompson, of some 10 pages called "The American Film Institute", which was published in a society for general education, or an article in 1973, in an issue called "The Crisis in Film Education".

More recently, we have had the firing of Frank Daniel, who was the dean of the Conservatory, and I think it would be important to enter into the record here the letter of Prof. Raymond Fielding, whose background as chairman of film at the University of Iowa, and later at the University of California at Los Angeles, and currently at Temple University, and he is a member of the academic advisory board. He wrote a letter to Mr. Heston, to Mr. Stevens, and all of the AFI trustees which was published in Variety, volume 276, number 3, page 31.

I would like to read that very briefly since it is only three paragraphs long. He says:

I would at the time I joined the Board of Trustees at the American Film Institute the organization's representation and credibility, at least, in academic, foundation and government circles was pretty low.

With the recent resignations of Frank Daniel on the West Coast and Sally Dixon on the East, I would guess it is now about zero. Within the last two or three years the turnover of first-rate people on the Institute staff has been absurdly high. Those that I know of include David Shepherd, Sam Kuller, Bob Heller, Ron Stoller, Dave Baxter, Richard Klein, Roger Heller, Joe Spencer, Frank Daniel and Sally Greedman.

I worked closely over the years with Stevens, Shepherd, Kuller, Baxter, Bass and Friedman, and I am familiar with the work of Sutton and Steller and have the highest regard for their talent, as does everyone in our field.

I don't know how such things are rationalized in industry but I know from experience that an academic and several service administrations with a turnover of three many first rate people in such a short time is considered a prima facie case of serious quality operational philosophy or incompetent management. I am also disturbed that we have not had a full meeting of the Board of Trustees since January

[illegible] letter was written in August.

So far as I can determine, no date has been set for a full meeting. I appreciate the fact that in ordinary circumstances the proper role for a trustee is to provide overall guidance for an organization and avoid unnecessary meddling in the work. However, I must confess I am beginning to worry about my own responsibilities and liability in this matter. Increasingly, I am being asked by people in the film/TV world, the foundations and the Washington community, to explain what in God's name is going on within the AFI. I find that I have no answers to give them, not even constructively dishonest ones.

Finally, I would also like to make one more thing a matter of public record. There was a meeting—the report of which I am going to submit for the record—a conference on regional developments of film centers and services held at the Mohawk Mountain House in New York, February 13 through 15, 1973. It was attended by 50 representatives of regional centers, museums, academies, and foundations, those who broadly represent, I think, the talents and energies of film development and education and in the art world of this country.

I am going to quote two passages from it. On page 19, this is to do again with, I think, a matter of your concern as representative, concern with outreach. This is to do with the model film center at Kennedy Center:

Participants raised objections to the AFI plan, saying regional centers should be encouraged to develop their own programing—

It is a [illegible] program to the current broadcasting service—

should be encouraged to develop their own programs rather than simply having to have programs sent to them by AFI.

A number of participants indicated they did not trust the AFI to properly carry out this project. A number of reasons were given. It was said that the interests and needs of film educators, film makers and regional film people have been consistently ignored by the American Film Institute. Participants who have been deeply involved in film study have not been consulted or even informed of the corporation selection and concepts.

It was said of the meeting in Washington that AFI did not in fact, represent or reflect the ideas of those who attended and one participant felt the corporation concept represented a fait accompli and not a structure open for consultation.

The Markle Foundation in New York has recently funded a study by Herman Land Corp., which has now written a four-volume report on the state of film art in the United States. Though that is a privileged document, I think you could, of course, request it from Mr. Forrest Chisman who is executive director of the Markle Foundation.

Its conclusion is the American Film Institute, which comes in, for some 30-page treatment, is to state that any visual arts would best be practiced on the road to create or find an alternative instrument or instruments through which to work. So, there have been two, I think, reactions or responses to the history of this organization during the

just 7 years. I think that some value judgments must now be made as they enter and ask for a third term.

I should probably just add that in terms of my own involvement, that I am a member of the University Film Association and the Society for Cinema Studies and the American Historical Film Association, and the University Center and Adviser of the U.S. Office of Education and the National Endowment of the Arts and the Humanities. Also, for 3 years I have been on the New York State Council of the Arts in a panel capacity where problems of proposals come before us from all elements of the field and I sit with the panel of experts and hear the data on those issues.

I think it is important, although I cannot represent any of those groups and could not, since this proposed legislation reached most of us so late that we did not have any proper consultation to bring before you our views in any representative sense, I hope you would think of me as a representative person engaged in the field and I think I have to report to you that there is some astonishment at this legislation, a great deal of discouragement that it is being proposed, and I think it will have one of two effects.

It will either divide the field of education further, or meet with massive opposition from the field of education.

[Mr. O'Grady's prepared statement and attachments follow:]

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF DR. GERALD O'GRADY, DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR MEDIA STUDY AND DIRECTOR OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL COMMUNICATION CENTER AT THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO AND DIRECTOR OF MEDIA STUDY/BUFFALO

I

I am Gerald O'Grady and I appear before this Subcommittee to speak against H.R. Bill 17021 as an educator. I took my own degrees from Boston College in Massachusetts and the University of Wisconsin and did post-doctoral work for three years at Oxford University on a Marshall Scholarship.

I am currently in residence at the State University of New York at Buffalo, one of four University Centers and the single largest component of the seventy-two colleges in the State University of New York System. I am founding Director of the Center for Media Study which intends to offer A.B., M.A., M.F.A., and Ph.D. degrees in film and video making, the study of their history and interpretation, and the investigation of their social and psychic effects. This is the first curriculum of its kind and is grounded in the physiology of sense perception, the psychology of the cognitive and affective processes, the political philosophies of social organization, the development of the technologies and industries of film and television, the exploration of the pedagogies of these areas, and, finally and most importantly, the traditions of all of the arts, their interrelationships and their place in our culture.

I am also Director of the Instructional Communication Center which produces all of its slides, graphic illustrations, films and videotapes for all of the 30,000 faculty and students engaged in all disciplines from archeology to zoology. My duties involve an understanding of film not only as an art form, but film as an ethnographic tool, and instructional instrument, a cultural document and a form of public entertainment and information. I also administer WBFO, one of the radio stations of the Public Broadcast System.

I am also founding Director of Media Study, an independent tax-free, public-service corporation which is separate from the University and established to serve the citizens of the Western New York Region through providing workshops in the production of film and television and free access to equipment as well as in scheduling viewings of important works in these media and acting as a regional information center about them.

I also founded the Media Center at Rice University in Houston, Texas and I have taught in the Graduate Department of Radio/Television/Film at the University of Texas, the Graduate Department of Film in the School of Art at

Education Conference in New York City, at the New School for Social Research in New York City, in the Graduate Department of Cinema Study at New York University in New York City, and at Hampshire College in Amherst, Massachusetts. During the course of any year, I visit and speak at some thirty or forty universities, colleges, secondary schools, and regional organizations of various kinds and have the opportunity to continually review developments in the field. My essay, "The Preparation of Teachers of Media," was first published in the *Journal of Teacher Education*, 3, 3 (1968) after being delivered at the Aspen Film Conference, "The Film: Art for Whose Sake," in June, 1968. It is often reprinted, and since it describes the philosophy and principles on which some of my activities today are based, I should like permission to enter it into this record. In addition to establishing film and television centers in universities and communities, I have been especially interested in the preparation of elementary and secondary school teachers through the Center for Understanding Media in New York City where I am a Fellow and a teacher.

I am a member of the University Film Association, the Society of Cinema Studies, the New York Film Council, the Conference on Visual Literacy, the National Council of Teachers of English, the Modern Language Association and the Popular Culture Association, as well as a Trustee of the Flaherty International Film Seminars. I have been a consultant on film and media to the U.S. Office of Education, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Television Laboratory, Channel 13, WNET in New York, and the University Advisory Committee of the American Film Institute. In the past, I have been a contributing editor to *Saturday Review* and an advisory editor to *Arts, Learning Through Media*, and will be editor of a new journal, *Media Study*, beginning in January, 1969. I have served for five years as a member of the Film Television Panel of the New York State Council on the Arts and have just been invited to join the Public Media Panel of the National Endowment for the Arts. In this capacity, I review grant application proposals on these media from all sectors of the field and share in the evaluatory discussion by informed experts each month, an experience which keeps me in close touch with developments in film and television throughout the State of New York and our country. Finally, I am a member of the National Committee on Film and Television Resources and Services, the activities of which I shall describe below.

I have given this long introduction about my activities, for the sole purpose of establishing my knowledge and my concern of the state of education in the field of film and television in the United States. Inasmuch as this is a Subcommittee on Education, I am grateful that you have responded affirmatively to our request that a few professional educators like Professor Perry of New York University and myself be allowed to give testimony today. While we cannot claim to represent the many film and television associations, organizations and institutions with which we are affiliated, since notice of this proposed legislature came to my attention but a few days ago when it was far too late to consult our colleagues, I hope that the extended presentation of the details and activities of our careers will nevertheless enable you to perceive us as representative of the concerns of film educators in this country, and that this will help you to attend to what we report to you. I myself feel that this is a point which must be especially urged on you because much of the previous testimony at these hearings has come from those who have either achieved fame through an exposure in the media which is not given to ordinary citizens, or achieved success in business, as much as such achievements are to be respected and honored, it must be questioned whether they endow such individuals with any special expertise in matters of educational policy and we who have achieved similar status within the field of professional education in film and media worry that too much authority is sometimes "transferred" to their statements because of their outstanding performances in fields which are often quite unrelated to education, and that the result is an unwise policy for our citizens. Many of us feel that this has been and continues to be a very special defect of the education operations of The American Film Institute.

II

I would like to place this question of film and television education within the widest possible context. Only by doing so can we become aware of the magnitude of the issues at stake.

In a book published this week, based on statistics, polls and interviews of our citizens over the past fifteen years, Ben Wattenberg's *What's Right With America*, all of the data indicated that the thing which Americans desire most for

[illegible] education, and that their own greatest lament is that they have not had more education themselves. This Subcommittee is aware, I know, of the [illegible] of all American art in school and that the activity that goes on in our schools is the single most essential factor in our growth as a nation. As the then member of the University-wide Committee on the Arts, a group of [illegible] appointed by Chancellor Boyer on the educational needs of the 375,000 students in the State University of New York System, I was moved to draft a statement on what part the film, television and media arts should play within the context of our state's educational program, and I am going to quote from that statement here.

A Media Philosophy and Policy

If we acknowledge media to be all of the *codes* of human expression and communication (including their materials, equipment and technological systems), then their study is absolutely necessary to *sine qua non* of human culture and this study would probably include all of the ways in which *those codes* interact with and influence each other in "instructing" human consciousness on its evolutionary journey. There is an analogy here to the ways in which the chemical codes of genes and chromosomes "spell out" the instructions that condition development and function in all living beings.

We must reimagine what the code of language of speech meant to human development. In his *Anthropological Linguistics*, Joseph Greenberg wrote: "The radically new type of adjustment that speech made possible clearly qualifies it as an evolutionary emergent of fundamental significance in that it initiated a distinctly new stage of development, comparable to the genesis of life itself and to the first appearance of intelligence." When, centuries later, this oral code was itself symbolically encoded in print, there took place the profound revolution described at length in Marshall McLuhan's *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Within our own century, the *codes* of the moving images of film and television must be recognized as cultural emergents of equal importance, components of the evolutionary phenomena of the twentieth century which has led to the vastly increased power of individuals to effect their environments and one another.

Unless one has mastery or competency in using and understanding the codes communication of his own era, one cannot adequately participate in decisions involving his life. *One is simply not free.* A prime example is a child; the word "infant" literally means "unable *to speak*." After the establishment of the first political democracies in the late eighteenth century, there was common agreement that *literacy*, the ability to *read and write*, was an absolute need for human freedom. The human needs and educational and cultural prerequisite of freedom in the twentieth century is *media-cy*: the ability to use, understand, and have access to the codes and modes of expression, communication and information transfer in contemporary society. All citizens have access to their culture and their societies, not just to language and print, but by a variety of other codes, especially those of the moving image, which are already pervasive.

We know that a contemporary American student will spend on the average of 10,000 hours in school by the time he is 18, yet he will have seen over 15,000 hours of television, 5,000 of them before he goes to school at all. He will have read 50 or 100 novels, but he will have screened over 500 feature films. His life in the 21st century, when he is middle-aged, will undoubtedly depend on his being able to cope with, understand, use and not be manipulated by the media. An immediate task is to bridge the gap that has developed between the culture of the media and the culture of the school. In "Education for Real," John McHale argues that our traditional, so-called cultural education, i.e., literacy, is now, at best, inadequate and, at worst, a form of creative disenfranchisement for our students from our emergent planetary culture which already possesses the means of transmitting any event in visual and aural codes to every being on multiple planets in real time, i.e. simultaneously.

Not only do the media codes give gene-like structuring to the human negotiation with the environment throughout history and not only do the understanding and access to them provide a basic freedom for social interchange and contribution to a participative society, but as Jerome Bruner and David Olson have demonstrated in a recent essay, "Learning through Experience and Learning through Media" (in George Gerbner, et al., edd., *Communications, Technology, and Social Policy*. New York: John Wiley, 1973), the human brain and related sensory organization is so structured that each of us perceives and structures the world according to the media by which he or she apprehends it. It is now

clear that the naive psychological concept that a human learns the same "information" about a thing irrespective of hearing it orally, reading about it, or seeing a film about it is wrong and misleading, and that one is "informed" differently by each medium. The logical implication is that we must keep the full body of our senses available and open to the channels and codes of all media which is why I was enrolled to pursue knowledge.

In a recent speech to the Directors and Heads of Departments at New York's Museum of Modern Art on the occasion of the first international study conference and exhibition of the art of television, "Open Circuits: The Future of Television," of which I was co-ordinator, I said:

> "In Keats's time and for a century after, works of art, perceived as objects, were in temples and palaces and museums, and they were available only to that small minority of humanity who were able to and could afford to travel across distances to perceive them. With television, the art form which is engaging us this afternoon, this view of art has been transformed. For in television, the object exists only when an electrical current is generating it at a specific series of moments in time, i.e., only when it is being created on a monitor. In one of his early essays, one of our current televisionaries remarked that the real business of television was none other than "the reprogramming of the sensory life of North America, changing the entire outlook and experience of the population of this continent." Here, then is an art form grounded in the modifications, the transformations of the intensity of light, the shades of colors, the compositions of spaces, the manipulations of forms within it, the rhythmic pulses through it, and the sound harmonized with it, to mention but a few of the elements which are simultaneously interacting with each other. And one man's personal creation, such as those you have seen this afternoon, can be transmitted, in its own original medium, untransformed—to every other human being in the world, and the minds and hearts of each of them can be sensitized to each of these elements and their interaction. And this ability to teach this discipline and pleasure to all minds, the ability to so powerfully raise the understanding and appreciation of all of the basic elements, the abstract principles, if you will, on which all of the other pictorial and spatial and moving and musical arts are based, will enable you to powerfully transform the traditional pedagogical function of the museum in a new world without walls."

In summary, let me use this strong language. The human brain is the only thing in the universe that makes an effort to understand itself. The progress of this understanding is *absolutely dependent* upon competency in all of the media codes which we have devised to instruct the brain through the various senses. In the sense that every member in a society communicates information to other members of that society, every member is both a teacher and a learner, and in order that teaching and learning, those processes *absolutely central* to our humanity, take place, it is essential that every member be able to use and understand *all of the codes* which we have evolved for this purpose. For a major university, a center dedicated to teaching and learning, to neglect developing an area of serious scholastic activity in the codes of the moving images would be not only *allogical but totally irresponsible*.

It should be noted that the forms of film and television, considered as arts, interact with the codes of sound (music), language (English or foreign), visual imagery (artist) and the human image (drama and dance). Film and television are focal points for students in all the arts, since they are pluralist or multivalent media which can develop a narrative, not in pictures and through a variety of audio codes, including speech and dialogue as well as music and environmental noise. Contemporary music and theatre pieces incorporate slides, films and videotapes and these arts cannot properly develop in our campuses without the presence of strong film/video programs.

In addition, a strong film program offers the students and the citizens in surrounding communities a museum of our national and international heritage of film. Without us, there is no way for the community to be made aware of and kept abreast of developments in contemporary media. (a) There are almost no classic films from the early American period shown anywhere else; there are no revivals of Chaplin, Griffith, Keaton, Vidor, et al. (b) We are the only institution screening the short experimental film. These are usually made on 16mm gauge rather than 35mm because the makers must finance them. Our commercial theatres are not equipped to screen them. We alone preserve and advance developments in this field. (c) No documentary films are ever shown in our commercial theatres, and we are the one resource for the hundreds of

excellent films in the long documentary tradition of Lumiere, Vertov, Grierson, Ivens, Leacock, et al., etc. It is we alone who open the community to the world. Neither the commercial theatres nor other institutions show foreign films, not only the French and the Italian and Swedish cinema, of which there is an occasional booking by a theatre, but the Yugoslavian, the Polish, the Brazilian and the Chinese cinema as well.

III

There is no doubt in my mind about the importance of film and television to the education of our citizens. In relation to H.R. 1750, this Subcommittee, in the ordinary course of its deliberations, must inquire into the educational policy and performance of The American Film Institute, which has now existed for seven years.

I think that it will find that The American Film Institute has not yet developed an educational policy, that it has no constituency, and that among our dedicated and knowledgeable educational professionals, it has essentially received a vote of no confidence. The Institute enjoys no reputation among our teachers, the editors and editors of our journals, the students at its own Center for Advanced Study, its own trustees and academic advisors from our field, and our para-educational colleagues who administer the museums, archives and regional film study centers in this country. I would call attention, in passing, to the regional concept as I feel that this Subcommittee must concern itself with the outreach of such an organization as The American Film Institute, ask itself whether it can possibly serve, as it claims to do, the diversified needs of our culture, and, moreover, whether its activities as an expensive centralized operation concern with its own needs are not in direct contradiction to its functioning as a *grant making agency* to regional institutions, and whether the paucity of its 4,000-person membership, 4,000 in the Washington, D.C. area, after concerted drives over a seven year period, does not indicate that it has developed virtually no constituency among our citizens, and certainly not in those districts which the members of the Sub-committee represent.

Education, for all its importance, has always ranked low among the priorities of The American Film Institute. From 1967-1971, the Institute spent $432,757 of its total budget of $7,944,188 on behalf of education, about 5%. By 1974, when it spent $61,000 of its $13 million budget, the share was 2%.

It is established fact that The American Film Institute fired its Director of Critical (Educational) Studies in January of 1971. This action, along with the history of educational endeavors during the first three years of funding, was fully described in a long article, "The American Film Institute," by Richard Thompson in a special issue, "Crisis in Film Education" in *The Journal of the Society of Education in Film and Television* (Autumn, 1971), and I would request permission to enter that essay into the records of these hearings. It concluded that the AFI's Center for Advanced Study "has been unable as an experimental educational project to give us an account of itself, to turn its activities and enormous cost (probably over $2 million) into any material or method of value to others in the field." I also request permission to enter into your records another evaluation of the Institute, "The Unloved One" by Ernest Callenbach, the Editor of *Film Quarterly* (Summer, 1971). In making suggestions for reform, Callenbach wrote: "It seems crucial to recognize that a successful AFI must be dedicated to promoting the film interests of *all* regions of the country, and must be in close touch with the varying problems of those regions." Although there was a re-shuffling by Mr. George Stevens, Jr. in the next issue, this advice has gone unheeded.

Less than two months ago, August, 1974, The American Film Institute fired the Dean of its Center for Advanced Film Studies, despite the almost unanimous protest of its own thirty advanced students who revealed their "deep feeling that Frank Daniel is the most important and valuable asset that the Center has in its acknowledged purpose: the education of future filmmakers." I request permission to enter the correspondence of present and former fellows with Mr. George Stevens, Jr. into your records. The current position of The American Film Institute, as it is seen by the educational field, is best summarized by a letter written to the Chairman of its Board of Trustees, Mr. Charlton Heston, by Professor Raymond Fielding of Temple University, himself a member of the Board. Professor Fielding has had a distinguished career as a film scholar and teacher at the University of Iowa and the University of California in Los Angeles, and is past President of the Society for Cinema Study. I would ask your permission to read Professor Fielding's letter and to enter its text, published in *Variety* (August 28, 1974), p. 29, into your records. He wrote:

I recall that at the time that I joined the board of trustees of the AFI, the organization's reputation and credibility—at least in academic, foundation, and governmental circles—was pretty low. With the recent resignations of Frank Daniel on the west coast and Sali Ann Kriegsman on the east, I would guess that it is now about zero.

Within the last two three years, the turnover of first-rate people on the Institute's staff has been absurdly high. Those that I know of include Dave Shepard, Sam Kula, Bob Geller, Ron Sutton, Dave Thaxton, Richard Kline, Roger Heller, Joe Dispenza, Frank Daniel, and Sali Ann Kriegsman. I have worked closely, over the years, with Shepard, Kula, Thaxton, Daniel, and Kriegsman, and am familiar with the work of Sutton and Geller, and I have the highest regard for all their talents and energy, as does everyone in our field. (I am not as familiar with the work of Kline, Dispenza, and Heller, and so cannot comment upon their departures.)

I don't know how such things are rationalized in private industry, but I can say from experience that in academic and civil service administration, a turnover of this many first rate people in so short a time is considered a prima facie case of either a faulty operational philosophy or incompetent management.

I am also disturbed that we have not had a meeting of the full board of trustees since January. So far as I have been able to determine, no date has yet been set for a full meeting.

As a trustee, I want to be as helpful and constructive as possible, and not to cause any more waves than necessary during this difficult period in the history of the Institute. I appreciate the fact that under ordinary circumstances the proper role for a trustee is to provide support and encouragement to the administrators of the organization, and to avoid unnecessary meddling in their work.

However, I must confess that I am beginning to worry about my own reputation and credibility in this matter. Increasingly, I am being asked by people in the academic world, the foundations, and the Washington community to explain what in God's name is going on within the AFI, and I find that I have no answers to give them—not even constructively dishonest ones.

I would like to urge that a meeting of the board of trustees be scheduled in late September or October, at which the director and the executive committee members can review these matters for us and explain their meaning and significance. The people who serve on the board have given a great deal in the way of time, energy, and (in many cases) financial support, and are entitled to know what has gone wrong—or right, as the case may be. Cordially, Raymond Fielding.

I myself can well understand Professor Fielding's desire for a meeting. Both Professor Perry and I are members of the Institute's University Academic Advisors and this group has not been consulted for over a year either, and feels that it has been quietly abandoned.

Because most of the needs for film study were not being satisfied, and because this was felt to result not so much from a misallocation of resources as from a lack of understanding and concern, a Conference on Regional Development of Film Centers and Services was called at New Paltz, New York on February 13 15, 1973, and it was attended by thirty-five of the most distinguished and dedicated directors of film museums, archives and regional centers as well as filmmakers and educators from eighteen cities throughout the country. This group, representative of the field, expressed a massive dissatisfaction with the policies of The American Film Institute. The printed report of this Conference is available from the Pacific Film Archive, University Art Museum, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, and I request permission to read sections from it into the records. On the issue of regional exhibition programs: "Participants raised objections to the AFI plan, saying regional centers should be encouraged to develop their own programming, rather than simply having packaged programming 'sold' to them by the AFI. These participants viewed the AFI approach as 'centralist,' one where the AFI would control regional exhibition rather than serving it" (p. 19).

On the issue of the selection of a core collection of films for study:

A number of the participants indicated that they did not trust the AFI to properly carry out this project. A number of reasons were given. It was said that the interests and needs of film educators, filmmakers and university film people had been consistently ignored by the AFI. Participants who had

[illegible] deeply involved in film study had not been consulted or even informed of the development of the core collection concept. It was said that minutes of the meeting in Washington on the core collection were written in such a way as to serve the purposes of the AFI and did not, in fact, represent or reflect the ideas of those who attended. One participant felt that the core collection concept was being presented to the conference as a "fait accompli" and not as a sincere desire for consultation. It was said that the Institute was so constituted so as to make it impossible for it to represent the best interests of the film study field. It was also felt that the national feeling of distrust toward the AFI made it unwise to work through them. (p. 29)

The invited participants unanimously passed a resolution recommending that an ad hoc committee "be established to search out and organize an entity representative of and responsible to the major organizations, institutions and memberships concerned with the making, preservation, distribution, exhibition and study of film and media, the servicing and education, broadly conceived, of the film, media needs of all our citizens." (p. 30). The members of this National Committee on Film and Television Resources and Services are:

James Blue—Co Director, Film Program, Rice University MEDIA CENTER
Eileen Bowser—Associate Curator, Dept. of Film, The Museum of Modern Art
John Culkin—Director, Center for Understanding Media
Sally Dixon—Curator, Film Section, Museum of Art, Carnegie Institute
Peter Feinstein—Exec. Sec., University Film Study Center, Cambridge, Mass.
Denise Davidson—Acting Director, Northwest Film Study Center, Portland Art Museum, Portland, Oregon
Sam Kula—Archivist, The American Film Institute, Washington, D.C.
Gerald O'Grady—Director, Center for Media Study, State University of New York at Buffalo
Sheldon Renan—Director, Pacific Film Archive, University Art Museum, Berkeley, California
Ron Sutton—Exec. Sec., National Association of Media Educators
Jonas Mekas—Director of the Anthology Film Archives and Board member of the New York Filmmakers' Cooperative, was appointed Recording Secretary.

During the first year of its existence, the Committee added the following members:

Frank Daniel—Dean, Center for Advanced Study, American Film Institute
Daniel Taradash—Screenwriter, former President of Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences
David Stewart—Director of Special Programs, Corporation of Public Broadcasting
Fred Barzyk—Producer-Director, WGBH Educational Foundation, Boston
John Kuiper—Head, Motion Picture Section, Prints and Photography Division, Library of Congress

Next month, this Committee will publish a report dealing with each of the five areas mentioned in the resolution above. It is the result of more than a year's research and writing by the members and their consultants, and will be freely distributed to all those concerned with film and television in the country. Regional meetings will discuss the report from January through April, 1975, and the response of the field to this report will be recorded and digested. Then, a final report on the needs of the various film and television constituencies in the United States and their suggested solutions to these needs will be prepared as a white paper and will be available by July. If this Subcommittee acts on H.R. 17021 without waiting for this consultation of their constituencies by established regional leaders, all people who have made contributions to the field, it will have completely disregarded this whole process which is being carried out voluntarily and without remuneration by those listed. As a member of that Committee, I urge you to put aside the proposed legislation until that time, so that you may reconsider it in the light of this survey of the media constituency.

For the past two years, another report, "The Independent Filmmaker in the Television Age," supported by the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation and carried out by the H. W. Land Corporation has been prepared. It is the result of two years research and 375 interviews with people representative of all forces in film. I would request that this Subcommittee request access to this material by writing to the Markle Foundation at 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, New York 10020. It is information absolutely essential to your decision-making process. Our government was founded on a concept of the state articulated by Thomas Hobbes and John Locke as a union of the wills of all its citizens. If H.R. 17021

is passed, it will have one of two results among those educators whose opinions I have been reflecting by careful quotation and documentation in this testimony. It will either disastrously divide the field against itself, or it will completely discourage it and unite its members' wills in massive opposition to the prepared legislation. Neither would serve the cause of film or of the large numbers of the American people who are giving their talents and energies to furthering it.

[From the Journal of Aesthetic Education]

The Preparation of Teachers of Media

(By Gerald O'Grady)

(Gerald O'Grady is Director of the Media Center at the University of St. Thomas in Houston and a member of the Faculty of Arts and Letters at the State University of New York at Buffalo, where he teaches graduate work in literature and cinema. He is also Visiting Associate Professor of English and of Radio, TV, Film at the University of Texas at Austin. This article was developed from a talk presented to the Aspen Film Conference held at Snowmass-at-Aspen in July, 1966, the theme of which was "The Film: Art for Whose Sake?")

I

Begin with the nature of man and the nature of his social organization: Kenneth Burke has shown us how "man is a symbol-using animal,"[1] and Hugh Dalziel Duncan has explained how "society rises in and continues to exist through the communication of significant symbols" and how "man creates the significant symbols he uses in communication."[2]

Proceed with the nature of education and of pedagogic instruction: J. L. Aranguren has pointed out that "education is the most fundamental means of socialization and therefore of communication"[3] and Jerome S. Bruner concluded some recent remarks on "Patterns of Growth" with "What I have said suggests that mental growth is in very considerable measure dependent upon growth from the outside in . . . a mastering of techniques that are embodied in the culture and that are passed on in a contingent dialogue by agents of the culture. This becomes notably the case when language and the symbolic systems of the culture are involved, for there are a multiple of models available in the culture for shaping symbolic usage—mentors of all shapes and conditions."[4]

We have arrived at the nature of our problem. In "Education for Real," John McHale argues that our traditional, so-called cultural, education is now, at best, inadequate and, at worst, a form of creative disenfranchisement from our emergent planetary culture, and makes a plea that the term "arts" be expanded to include our advanced technological media.

> The problem, now, is that those areas of our formal education which deal with the symbolic and value content of our culture do so almost entirely in terms of the past. By and large, they avoid immediate relevance to the external cultural environs in which the person finds himself. Outside the school, university or other educational institution these environs are those of the film, TV, radio, the pictorial magazine and massive "advertisement" of an enormously proliferated "mass" culture brought into being by our accelerated technology. It is largely within these media, now on a global scale, that the symbolic and value communication of our cultural situation is carried on.[5]

II

The solution—how these new symbolic forms, the media art, might be incorporated into various stages of our educational processes—is not so easily revealed.

---

[1] Kenneth Burke, "Definition of Man" in *Language As Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), p. 3.

[2] Hugh Dalziel Duncan, *Symbols in Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 44, 47.

[3] J. L. Aranguren, *Human Communication* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), p. 158.

[4] Jerome S. Bruner, *Toward a Theory of Instruction* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), p. 21.

[5] John McHale, "Education for Real" in Edwin Schlossberg and Lawrence Susskind (eds.), *Good News: A Curricula of Ideas to Be Implemented*, p. 5. The essay also appears in the World Academy of Art and Science *Newsletter* (June 1966) and is anthologized by Richard Kraus (ed.), *Dialogue on Education* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967), pp. 120–25.

as illustrated by the current confusion and disagreement about the teaching of film, to take the medium featured in this issue.

1. Should film criticism or film appreciation be taught, as they are in most colleges and universities which have recently added such courses, by members of the traditional departments in the humanities, such as English, French, classics?[1] Will they misunderstand the very topics, such as structure, theme, and value, which they are usually most capable of examining, because they have almost no knowledge of the techniques by which and circumstances in which the new media are produced?

2. Should such courses be taught solely by departments of communication or of journalism and speech or of radio/television/film? Have even the younger members of such departments been given sufficient preparation in perceiving their subjects as art forms shaping our cultural environment or do they, as often seems the case, perceive them mainly as channels of information? Do members of these departments overemphasize technique and production to the detriment of the symbolic cultural values that concern McHale?

3. Should art departments expand their offerings to include photography, film, and television? Is it clear thinking or just accident that, on many campuses, photography is taught by the art department but film, with the exception of production courses, by other departments? (Why is it, incidentally, that still photography is part of the cinema curriculum in most European film schools but not in their American counterparts?) If photography is "still," aren't a great many paintings and sculptures becoming kinetic?

4. Should the teaching of film be placed in a more general context, which might be called media studies? If new departments or programs of media studies are created, there are two questions: how should their subject matter be defined and what kinds of curricula and training should they offer their students?

In the short run, obviously, one simply chooses the most knowledgeable and skilled person, regardless of his departmental affiliation, to teach film. In the long run, I would opt for new multidepartmental programs of media studies.

III

How, then, should media studies be defined? Until a few years ago, the study of media usually meant the investigation of the transformation of information to mass audiences by means of newspaper, radio, and television; film, in its documentary guise, was sometimes included, as was the Hollywood feature film if studied, usually in quantitative fashion, in terms of audience patterns, class entertainment preferences, etc. The word "public" was usually understood to preface "media," and students pursued their programs within a curriculum which was much concerned with government policy and the advertising market—e.g., censorship and sponsorship. With the war came an emphasis on the measurement of propaganda, which continued during the years of the cold war, followed more recently by an emphasis on the relationship of media to voting behavior.

About twenty years ago, a new concept began to emerge in the work of Marshall McLuhan. His three books, the humanistic leitmotif of which is the "man" of their subtitles, approached media from just as many different perspectives. The first, *The Mechanical Bride: Folklore of Industrial Man* (1951), was *mythological* and concentrated on newspapers, magazines, advertising, pulp fiction, and comic books: what was then called popular culture. The second, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (1962), was *historical* and juxtaposed a massive set of modifications on the cultural interactions arising from the invention of the printing press: turning our attention away from the content and toward the form of print, he explained the cliche, "the medium is the message."[2]

---

[1] Some would include film study under drama. See Richard M. Gobin, "Film as Dramatic Literature," *College English* Vol. 30 (1969), 424-29.

[2] McLuhan himself first used the term as the title of the first chapter of *Understanding Media* and pointed on it in the title of his next book, with Quentin Fiore, *The Medium Is the Massage* (New York: Bantam, 1967). In a recent interview in *Playboy* (March 1969), he indicates that puns and hyperboles are strategies for drawing attention to new insights. In general, more time has been spent on misunderstanding McLuhan as a popular medium than in understanding his work; recent books, subtitled "Hot and Cool," "Pro and Con," "Sense and Nonsense," produce few insights. More accurate "placements" of his work are found in the reviews by Hugh Dalziel Duncan, "Communication in Society," *Arts in Society* Vol. 3 (1966) and John McHale, "The Man from Mascom," *Progressive Architecture* Vol. 6 (February 1967).

later associated with his work: "Technological environments are not merely passive containers of people but are active processes that reshape people and other technologies alike."[1] The third, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (1964), was *formal* and followed seven groundwork chapters dealing with their psychic and social consequences with twenty six more (symbolically the new alphabet) on the structures of individual media. It was this idea of media as extensions of our senses, as expanders of our psychic environments, and their aesthetically oriented treatment as forms, structures, and models shaping our physical environment, conceived of as an art form, which caught the contemporary imagination.

According to McLuhan's *formal* treatment, almost everything can be considered a medium, including all our languages—"language is the first mass medium." Pursued, that ideal could reshape our entire educational structure and all its subjects or fields in new ways. Given the completely remote possibility of that happening, I would like to delimit media studies to mean the exploration of the creation, the aesthetics, and the psychological, social, and environmental impact of the art forms of photography, cinematography, videography, radio, recordings, and tapes within the broad framework of general education in the humanities. I would call media studies the "new humanities" to distinguish them from the "old humanities"—literature, drama, the fine arts, etc.—from which they often borrow and with which they continually interact, mutually influencing each other.

I would make a special plea that, in our curricula, the new never be separated from the old.[2] When the student of Greek reads Plato's *Republic* and faces the question of why the whole Hellenic system of education was changing, I would want him to have to ponder Eric Havelock's answer: "The fundamental answer must be in the changing technology of communication. Refreshment of memory through written signs enabled a reader to dispense with most of that emotional identification by which alone the acoustic record was sure to recall."[3] The student in my period of specialization, the late medieval, undergoes a valuable heuristic process when he is made to consider the implications for literary form and style of McLuhan's many insights concerning the transition from script to print.[4] The student of contemporary fiction will gain nothing but profit by meditating upon Bertold Brecht's remark: "For the old forms of communication are not unaffected by the development of new ones, nor do they survive alongside them. The filmgoer develops a different way of reading stories. But the man who writes the stories is a filmgoer too."[5]

The intersection of contemporary art forms almost demands that we inaugurate a field of cross-media studies. In the past, men of letters (today, the phrase seems to point toward print) wrote in different genres—poems, plays, novels, essays. Some, like Henry James or George Bernard Shaw, wrote dramatic criticism and novels or fiction criticism and plays. Still others, like the Polish Bruno Schulz or the Welshman David Jones, were writer-painters or writer-drawers. Arthur Miller is one key example of the emergence of a new kind of writer, the writer for many media, who has confronted and been deeply influenced by the communications explosion of our century. While his sole medium is writing, his first efforts were for radio drama, and the style of his stage plays will be better understood when the latter are examined. Later, he wrote for and was influenced by film, and his last play, *The Price*, began as a television piece. He has also written short stories and novels. He has said: "Movies, the most wide-spread form of art on earth, have willy-nilly created a particular way of seeing life, and their swift transitions, their sudden bringing together of disparate images, their effect of decentration inevitable in photography, their economy of storytelling, and their concentration on mute action have infiltrated the novel and play writing—especially the latter—without being confessed to or, at times, being consciously realized at all."[6] The poet Michael Benedikt concluded an explanation of God-

---

[1] Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), preface.

[2] This in no means implies that the newer media should be studied only as a means toward interesting students in the classics like Shakespeare and Dickens, an attitude put forth by David Riesman in his introduction to Reuel Denney's *The Astonished Muse: Popular Culture in America* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964), p. vi.

[3] Eric A. Havelock, *Preface to Plato* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 288.

[4] John Willett, trans., *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic* (London: Methuen, 1964), p. 47.

[5] Arthur Miller, *The Misfits* (New York: Viking Press, 1961), pp. ix–x.

ard's *Alphaville* in terms of Paul Eluard's novels and the philosophy of the Surrealists.

> What I have to say here is that, in considering the background of a major creator like Godard, it seems improper to restrict considerations to the medium in which such a creator happens to be operating. Just as it is no longer possible to take a literary criticism seriously which cuts itself off from the film and other media, it is no longer possible to view a creator like Godard as operating solely, or even *primarily*, out of a background of the visual arts—even the cinematic developments of the past few years. It seems to me that *Alphaville* is an excellent place from which to launch a useful series of fresh confrontations.[8]

Indeed, other critics have pointed out *Alphaville's* allusions to (and thus dependence for meaning on) *Oedipus Rex*, the stories of Orpheus and Lot and detective fiction as well as *Nosferatu* and other films. Godard's first treatment names the scientist Leonardo da Vinci,[9] which explains why the movie version's Dr. Von Braun's first name is Leonardo, that it is Godard's attempt to mythically encircle the entire machine culture, ending with the father of our bomb and beginning with the first artist (included in the Museum of Modern Art's recent exhibition, "The Machine As Seen at the End of the Mechanical Age."[10]

IV

Even if we could agree on my rough definition of media studies, on their necessary relationship to the traditional arts, and on the interest and importance of explorations in cross-media studies, we should not rush to formulate curricula for the preparation of media teachers until we have examined our social structure for changes and trends such as the following, which are only a few entries in what could become a long list.

1. Just as affluence and qualitative democracy were topics of the early 1960's, replaced by the later stress on poverty and participatory democracy, so yesterday's interest in distinguishing high, middlebrow, and mass cultures is shifting to today's concern for a new definition of popular culture.[11] The films of Bergman, Antonioni, Godard, and others are high culture in the old sense and popular culture only in the sense that they are seen by a large number of people.[12] When, in the 1980's, university teachers look back to evaluate the cultural life of the fifties and sixties for their students, they must admit, I think, that the construction, the choice of theme and philosophical treatment, and the influence on thought of the films of these and a dozen other directors were at least as important as the best poetry, drama, and fiction, and perhaps more so because they were so much more widely discussed.

2. Works of similar quality created by artists working with videotape[13] will not become popular in this new sense until we break the commercial stranglehold on television. Robert M. Hutchins has written:

> So a country that is chiefly interested in turning out consumers and producers is not likely to be much concerned with setting minds free; for the connection between selling, manufacturing, and free minds cannot be established. Such a country will transform new opportunities for education into means of turning out producers and consumers. This has been the fate of television in the United States. It could have been used for educational purposes—but not in a commercial culture. The use of television, as it was employed in the United States in the 1950's, can be put in its proper light by supposing that Gutenberg's great invention had been directed almost entirely to the publication of comic books.[9]

---

[8] Michael Benedikt, "Alphaville and Its Subtext" in Toby Mussman (ed.), *Jean-Luc Godard: A Critical Anthology* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1968), p. 220.

[9] *Alphaville, A Film by Jean-Luc Godard* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968), p. 97.

[10] K. G. Pontus Hultén, *The Machine As Seen at the End of the Mechanical Age* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1968), p. 15.

[11] The concerns of the contributors to the Spring, 1960, issue of *Daedalus*, devoted to "Mass Culture and Mass Media," are already somewhat dated.

[12] Last year, the Motion Picture Association of America asked Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., to make a survey of the American audience. The report indicated: "The more educated the public the larger the interest in and attendance at movies. The less educated are less interested." See Motion Picure Association of America, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York: *A Year in Review June 8961*, p. 11.

[13] Stan VanDerbeek and Scott Bartlett have both created new film forms by using videotapes. On April 14, 1969, the American Film Institue established a Television Filmmakers' Program.

[9] Robert M. Hutchins, *The Learning Society* (New York: Praeger, 1968), p. 127.

While this is by no means completely true, it makes its point by overstatement. Peter F. Drucker has remarked: "Few messages are as carefully designed and as shortly communicated as the thirty second, television commercial. . . . Few teachers wield in their entire teaching careers as much time or thought on preparing their classes as is invested in the many months of writing, drawing, acting, filming, and editing one thirty-second commercial."[7]

4. Higher education, as Peter Schrag recently pointed out "will not only be democratized but will become, in a society that has solved its major production problems, a way of life," and the means will be "via special institutes, books, tapes, films, travel."[8] When we place this beside McLuhan's observation that today a children have had five years of adult education via television before they ever enter class, we can recognize that media teaching and teachers will be at the center of innovation in planning curricula and, more likely, in completely reshaping our educational institutions. In his recent essay, "The Future of University Education As an Idea," Charles Muscatine predicted that "as more and more university instruction goes on in extramural institutions and in field studies here and abroad, the university will tend to lose its character as a place with clear geographical and intellectual boundaries, a place where one spends a definite amount of time and acquires a certain amount of knowledge. It will become, rather, a point or center from which knowledge and teaching radiate into the surrounding environment, and the possible relations of individuals to it will have many gradations, altering with age and circumstances."[9]

5. Individuals in our society will become increasingly mobile because the knowledge explosion means that the organizational charts of all of our institutions—governments and corporations as well as universities—will be made up of project groups rather than stratified functional groups. Warren G. Bennis rejects that "Adaptive, problem-solving, temporary systems of diverse specialists, linked together by coordinating and task-evaluating executive specialists in an organic flux—this is the organizational form which will gradually replace bureaucracy as we know it."[10] Future media teachers will be entering into many temporary groups, which will require a high degree of adaptability in personality structure, enabling them to establish relationships quickly and intensely and, shortly later, dissolve them. To have the personnel interchange demanded by this application of new knowledge will mean the maximization of sameness among people, and this in turn, as Philip E. Slater shows, can be summed up in the new educational objective, "Less variety from person to person requires more variety within each person."[11] We have to look forward to a changing nature of man within rapidly "self-renewing" community structures.[12] This has been called "the protean style" and involves the idea of a lifetime of personal change, an adulthood of continuing self-transformation and of adaptability and openness to a world in permanent revolution.

V

What kinds of curricula and training should Media Studies programs offer their students? After describing some general guidelines set forth at the Waltham Conference, I shall briefly describe and comment upon a short-term program for current graduate students in the humanities and then propose three models for undergraduate education in Media Studies—a full four-year program, a core curriculum for the first two years of a residential college, and a two-year sequence of courses for a major.

During the weekend of January 19-21, 1968, a group of twenty-eight leading practitioners and advocates of screen education met together in Waltham, Massachusetts, at a conference sponsored by the American Film Institute and the National Film Study Project. The section on the training of teachers in our published proceedings reads in part:

---

[7] Peter F. Drucker, *The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to Our Changing Society* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), p. 337.

[8] Peter Schrag, "The End of the Great Tradition," *Saturday Review*, Vol. 51, No. 11 (February 15, 1969), 26.

[9] Charles Muscatine, "The Future of University Education As an Idea" in Walter J. Ong (ed.), *Knowledge and the Future of Man* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), p. 47.

[10] Warren G. Bennis and Philip E. Slater, *The Temporary Society* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 74. The quotation from Slater is on p. 82.

[11] See J. H. van den Berg, *The Changing Nature of Man: Introduction to a Historical Psychology* (New York: Dell, 1964), and Jerome F. Scott and B. P. Lynton, *The Community Factor in Modern Technology* (Paris: UNESCO, 1962).

Screen educators are becoming aware of the need for comprehensive media education, based on the training of sensibility, response and perceptual awareness of the past and present.

We welcome the trend toward interdisciplinary teaching which we find compatible with elements inherent in media education.

Although the prognosis for the immediate future is that screen educators will come from the traditional areas—English, art and the humanities—the more distant future will see specialists from media departments.

To implement such programs teachers need modes of experience and training which are not adequate in existing institutions.[2]

A. MODEL FOR A SUMMER PROGRAM IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS

One proposal now before several foundations and granting agencies has the aim of encouraging very talented students, who are now pursuing graduate studies in the traditional humanities at major centers of higher education to study the media arts in depth during the coming summer and to teach and administer media studies programs at several different educational and social levels next year. The students would be selected from Princeton, State University of New York at Buffalo, University of California at Santa Cruz, University of Southern Illinois, and University of Texas.

The twelfe-week summer program would be mainly concerned with instruction in making photographs, films, and videotapes, which would include a review and criticism of the creative traditions in each of these art forms. Faculty members from English, psychology, sociology, drama, and film history would hold month-long seminars on the relationship of the humanities, the behavioral sciences, and media studies; on the availability of media materials (slides, tapes, etc.), their sources and costs, and the variety of ways in which they can be prepared for teaching presentations; and on current curricula and programs involving media at all stages of the educational process.

During the following year each of the students would be involved in three projects at his location. One student, for example, would teach a freshman course in media at his university and another media course at a junior high school, and would work with a group of ghetto filmmakers. Another would teach a media course at a junior college near his university and a film course to a continuing adult education group, and would organize a community media-mart in which local high school teachers could apply for film selections, bibliographies, and media consultants and lecturers on all kinds of topics embraced by media.

The purpose of simultaneous exposure to several different environments in the learning process is to acclimate the students to assume roles rather than to pursue specialized tasks, and to stimulate them to think concretely, yet broadly, about new solutions for teaching the media arts. Another objective is to create models of interaction and interchange of personnel, knowledge, equipment, and materials between universities, viewed as seminal centers radiating outward, and programs involving urban and minority groups, groups under psychological treatment, and groups of adults engaged in continuing education, as well as programs in junior colleges, and secondary and primary schools.

B. MODEL FOR A FOUR-YEAR UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

The usual four-year program leading to a degree includes about 120 hours of accredited instruction. The following program in media studies, which began at a small college in one of our largest cities, envisioned combining the experiences of an art school with those of a traditional education in the liberal arts and a domestic "peace corps" type operation. About forty hours of instruction were to be given to explorations in the new image-making technologies—photography, cinematography, videography—which would provide the focus and *raison d'etre* for the program as a whole. Students would undertake this creative work while simultaneously being exposed, through film rentals, slide collections, and exhibitions, to the best work of the past and present; and from this continued confrontation of tradition with individual talent would evolve discussions of theory and aesthetics (topics not "taught" as formal units but regarded as perpetual and ultimate concerns. This whole process of viewing, making, comparing, debating was conceived as one undivided four-year stream of creation.

---

[2] Jane Anne Hannigan and David J. Powell (eds.), *The Waltham Conference: Screen Education in the United States 1973, K–12* (printed and distributed by Films Incorporated).

Another forty hours would be given to the humanities—literature, philosophy, music, and the fine arts—the experiencing and formal analysis of the great texts, compositions, and art works from the beginning of civilization to the present. It was thought that image-makers in the new media should be rooted in the ways in which man had imaged forth himself and his concerns in the traditional media which continue to be lively and influential. It is just this emphasis which production-oriented curricula usually lack, and the shallowness and "vast wasteland" aspects of contemporary communication are an obvious result.

Finally, a third forty hours of work would concentrate on the behavioral sciences because it was believed that the creators of media should be knowledgeable about and fully responsible for the psychic and social consequences of their work. Each student would be acquainted with the various models and theories of the formation, growth, and abnormalities of the human mind, and special attention would be given to the ways in which visual and auditory images are related to growth from infancy onwards, an area in which research is just beginning. He would also learn to analyze human groups, the ways in which man has organized his relationships with other men, focusing on the media which each group—family, village, globe—uses to bind itself together and how this is accomplished.

A few aspects of the program might be singled out for special comment. A surprising number of the forty hours in the behavioral sciences were to be worked out through participation in community projects. A quote from a recent article in *The Christian Science Monitor* (November 23, 1968) is relevant here. It is headlined "Education: Off-Campus Service":

> At Harvard, the growing interest of students in community involvement has caused Phillips Brooks House to recommend to the college administration that an undergraduate department of urban studies be launched.
>
> "If the current trend continues, volunteer work at Phillips Brooks House will become an unofficial major for students," Mr. Profit prophesied. "The university should start its own program to meet this interest. A student's association with the house could then be his way of doing field work in his major."
>
> "This would be the best way to meet the current situation," he concluded.

One example of the possibility for this type of activity in the media studies program involves the day-school education of psychologically disturbed children in one of the city's hospitals. Its director familiarizes the media students, through readings, discussions, and observation, with the psychological and sociological models he uses in treating the children and with the practical problems that arise. The students use cameras and tapes to document the children's activities, and then, having become acquainted with the children through the media, begin to make short videotapes and films for them, and finally, to teach them to communicate with each other through the new media.

Another aspect of the program which deserves comment is the recruitment of film-making teachers. It was thought best to engage a variety of outstanding artists for semester-long residencies, enabling the students to live with a number of styles and attitudes of commitment. The first visitor, appropriately, was Stan Vanderbeek who had produced animated, collage, videotape-generated, and computer films, was then on a Rockefeller Foundation grant for experimentation in nonverbal communication, and had also moved into mixed-media presentations while theorizing on the future forms and functions of cinema.[8] Vanderbeek's legacy was a twenty-five-page curriculum, partly developed in an earlier experience in Allan Kaprow's continuing education program at the State University of New York at Stoneybrook, which centered on a developing series of assignments in image exploration (producing five films in a six-week summer course) and was related to viewing approximately one hundred experimental shorts which were listed (along with their distributors). These covered the entire history of avant garde film-making and comprised what I referred to above as "the tradition." The second film-maker in residence was James Blue, and our juxtaposition was purposeful. Whereas Vanderbeek's background was art—he had attended Black Mountain College—and improvisation, Blue had graduated from the University of Oregon as a drama major and later from the Institut des Hautes Etudes Cinématographiques in France. His course, during which each of the twenty-five students made seven films, was centered on matching image to sound and was built on a viewing of the classics, giving attention to the image-building (visual

[8] Stan Vanderbeek, "Culture: Intercom and Expanded Cinema," *Tulane Drama Review*, Vol. 11 (Fall, 1966), 38–48.

and aural) of dramatic structures and roles. Blue had just finished interviewing, on a Ford Foundation grant, the directors around the world who used animation in their films.[7] He composed a list of nearly three hundred features which he thought young film-makers should see during the years of their first explorations, and also wrote a twenty-page paper "Equipment List for a Beginning Film-making Course," a thorough examination of the various capabilities of cameras and sound equipment currently on the market, including a set of purchasing choices directly related to the ability of the students. I believe that the gathering and distribution of these kinds of "practical papers" from contemporary practitioners like Vanderbeek and Blue are one of the essential needs for film and media education.[8]

Finally, a few sentences should be written about the future social roles of graduates from this four-year model program. The program was not narrowly vocational, but conceived of as a liberal education stressing exploration in the variety of ways of structuring and using the new image-making technologies or media in relation to man's history of expressing and communicating through his traditional media and to contemporary man's psychic and social awareness, all pointing toward participation in and service to the community. Some of the students, it is hoped, would become tomorrow's artists; others would move, via graduate studies in a variety of departments, into the kind of media research of which McLuhan has made us aware, with the advantage of a thorough familiarity with the creative act in these technologies, often unknown to our present theorists; others would become, in the most immediate way, the media teachers we now need in our primary and secondary schools.

C. MODEL PROGRAM FOR A NEW RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE

A relatively new movement in the large state university educational systems of California and New York is the establishment of a number of undergraduate residential colleges on campus. These serve the twin purposes of decentralization and curriculum innovation, aiming to identify the student with a group of manageable size for building his personal and educational orientation during his years at the university, and to provide opportunities for faculty and students, working together, to reassess education in the light of new interdisciplinary concerns. Such colleges have a mandate to develop core curricula for their students' first two years, and based on this experience, to develop new departments and programs in which upper-level undergraduates may specialize.

As far as I know, only one of these new residential colleges has decided to concern itself with media studies, and since it is still on the drawing-board, I can give only a very general description of the contours of a program which its faculty have worked out after the first year's planning sessions. Its provisional title is Ernst Cassirer College, and it grows out of his concern with a synthesis of knowledge based on the proposition that symbolic systems engender the whole mental development that sets men apart from their zoological brethren. It will construct its core curriculum around the semiotics of languages, the codes of media, and the study of utopias. In essence, it would place the beginning undergraduate in a forum centered on symbolic forms. It would be hoped that the concerns of anthropologists with structural linguistics could be related to premises in "vidistics" recently put forward in the work of Sol Worth, Christian Metz, and Peter Wollen,[9] and that these, in turn, would flow naturally into the investiga-

[7] Some of Blue's interviews have already appeared in *Film Comment*, and he will soon publish the whole collection in a single volume.

[8] These papers are being prepared for publication by the staff of the Media Center at the University of St. Thomas, Houston, Texas. Copies of *Light and Vision: Photographs from the Beginning Classes at the Media Center*—Introduction by Geoffrey Winningham (Houston, 1969) are available from the Media Center, 3812 Mt. Vernon, Houston, Texas 77006. *The American Film Institute's Guide to College Film Courses 1969-70*, the first of an annual survey, can be obtained by writing to the Institute at 1815 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. It should be complemented by Professor Richard Byrne's *A Survey of Coursework in Cinematography and Film Production in Selected American Colleges and Universities*, sponsored by The Radio-Television-Film Interest Group of the Speech Association of America and distributed by Wisconsin State University, Stevens Point, Wisconsin. The National Association of Broadcasters publishes an annual report entitled "Radio-Television Degree Programs in American Colleges and Universities." It can be obtained by writing to Dr. Harold Niven, NAB, 1771 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

[9] See Sol Worth, "Cognitive Aspects of Sequence in Visual Communication," *A-V Communication Review*, Vol. 16 (1968), 121-45, and "Film as Non-Art," *The American Scholar*, Vol. 35 (1966), 322-34; Christian Metz, *Essais sur la signification au cinema* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1968); Peter Wollen, *Signs and Meanings in the Cinema* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1969).

tion and planning of the social organizations or cultures within which the symbolic modes and codes arise. A media studies program or department, now nonexistent, would arise experientially from the encounter of teachers and students within this context, and its staff would then offer a junior-senior major centered at this particular college but open to students from all thirty of the projected colleges.

As my opening remarks indicate, the study of symbolic forms seems a proper place for media studies to be situated, and my plea for a connection with the older humanities could be met, though in a formal way, by the study of languages, and by a study of the utopian community in history. The latter, according to its planning committee, would involve the Hebraic prophetic visions—and thus an awareness of "transcendental" media, the voice heard and the light seen;[8] dystopias—such as Nazi Germany—and thus the analysis of, for example, "Hitler's theory of rhetoric as a means toward social identification,"[9] and what Kingsley Amis calls "serious science fiction"—and thus the study of expanded cinema, computer graphics, and satellite intercom. Cassirer's first students will not be finishing their undergraduate education until the mid 1970's, and, by then, its developing programs should be providing information about the preparation of media teachers.

B. Model for a Two-Year Media Studies Major

Since Program B is visionary and Program C is related to the establishment of a new educational community, itself a somewhat utopian idea, I wish to conclude this section with a preliminary course outline for a media studies major which could be developed immediately in any of our larger universities having (or willing to appoint) interested faculty members within the necessary schools or departments.

Junior Year

First Semester	*Second Semester*
Explorations in Photography I	Explorations in Photography II
Fine Arts Laboratory	Media Laboratory
Narrative Structures I	Narrative Structures II
Media and Technology	Media and Environment
Elective	Elective

Senior Year

Explorations in Film-making I	Explorations in Film-making II
Explorations in Videography I	Explorations in Videography II
Narrative Structures III	Narrative Structures IV
Media and Behavioral Sciences I	Media and Behavioral Sciences II
Elective	Elective

I am dispensing with prerequisites, such as science, philosophy, and languages, which would be completed during the first two years and, in some cases, serve as bases for continuing study under electives. Let us imagine a university which has a College of Fine Arts which could supply the teachers for photography and the creative arts lab, a College of Architecture with faculty members oriented toward technology and environmental study and willing to concern themselves with media, a College of Communication with a Department of Film and Television including some faculty member interested in the applications of these and other media to classroom teaching, and a College of Arts and Sciences which would provide behavioral scientists with an interest in media and collect a group in the humanities—literature, philosophy, history, art—who were students of narrative structures. The faculty members would not leave their departments, but teach one course in the media studies program. An exciting fallout, of course, would be the generation of cross-college communication based on the shared concern for the university as an environment capable of innovating programs relevant to contemporary society and today's students.

The instruction in the image technologies—photography, cinematography and videography—would be exploratory, as indicated, and would include a familiarity

[8] In this connection, see W. Richard Comstock, "Marshall McLuhan's Theory of Sensory Form: A Theological Reflection," *Soundings*, Vol. 51 (1968), 160–83.

[9] See the chapter with this title in Hugh Dalziel Duncan, *Communication and Social Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 225–27.

with the creative traditions of these forms in ways like those suggested above. Given the great potential of television and the deplorable state of much of its current offering, it is hoped that special attention (and funds) would be centered on this part of the program. The courses offered by the architects could begin with the work of Buckminster Fuller and the topics suggested by McLuhan, Edward T. Hall (*The Hidden Dimension*), and others, and include community planning which would treat the various media as information systems.

After the student had some experience in using a medium (in this case, photography), the media lab would focus on the basic principles of light and sound as media of artistic expression and information transfer, in the same way that the preceding fine arts lab had concentrated on line, color, volume, etc., and had encouraged an interest in drawing or sculpture that could be developed by the talented in their electives. The behavioral science courses would involve the concepts described in our four-year program and consider media in cross-cultural terms,[7] and perhaps make the students aware of the uses and limitations of various media for documenting social and the cultural phenomena.[8] The four-semester course in narrative structure would be a historical survey of the ways of telling a story or organizing events or constructing an argument in fiction, history, and philosophy and by depiction in the arts: Greek vases, medieval art, the formal analysis of individual texts and art works, and the influence of historical conditions and cultural outlooks on their formation. At the end of tapestries and stained glass windows, comic books, etc. The emphasis would be the course, photography, film, and television would be placed in a new perspective, that of the "older humanities," and rich materials for cross-media studies would have emerged. I should add that such a course in narrative structures would probably be encouraged by teachers of literature on two grounds: (1) some of the best recent books on traditional authors in their area, Rosemond Tuve's study of George Herbert, D. W. Robertson's of Chaucer, Ronald Paulson's of Hogarth in relation to the eighteenth-century novel, and Angus Fletchers' *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode*, all of which include pictorial material, convincingly demonstrate that literature and depiction are interdependent disciplines;[9] (2) film and television have already and will continue to adapt the texts that they teach; a study like George Bluestone's *Novels into Film: The Metamorphosis of Fiction into Cinema* (1957) is already well established, and Robert Gessner's *The Moving Image: A Guide to Cinematic Literacy* (1968) has recently broken new ground.

Those notes on the preparation of teachers of media would be incomplete if I did not touch upon developing links with (1) sensitivity training and group dynamics, (2) Lévi-Straussian structuralism, and (3) ecological studies and futurism.

1. The relationship of media studies to sensitivity training and group therapy seems to have come about in two ways. First, McLuhan's books, which are popular with the students and the younger academics who show the greatest interest in media, are based on a model of the sensory life, which he calls a "ratio," and which enables him to argue that one sense is stunted as another is extended by the development of a certain media technology. Thus made aware, and given some exploratory hypotheses why it is that much of their sensory life is underdeveloped, students have taken a renewed interest in the body: in biology and physiology, as well as in the psychoses resulting from its repressed needs, as revealed in Norman O. Brown,[10] and the "therapeutic" exercises designed to "unbind" the psyche by training the senses, put forward in books like William C. Schutz's *Joy: Expanding Human Awareness* (1957) and elsewhere. Second, these same students and younger academics have become interested in the newly developing art forms of expanded cinema,[11] mixed media shows, and happenings,

---

[7] See John Adair and Sol Worth, "Navaho Filmmakers," forthcoming in the *American Anthropologist*.

[8] See, e.g., John Collier, Jr., *Visual Anthropology: Photography As a Research Method* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967).

[9] My use of the term "depiction" is derived from I. A. Richards, *Design for Escape: World Education Through Modern Media* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968), p. 10.

[10] Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History* (Wesleyan, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1959). The books of R. D. Laing, *The Divided Self* and *The Politics of Experience* have also contributed to this interest.

[11] The best explanations of expanded cinema have appeared in Gene Youngblood's columns in the *Los Angeles Free Press*. His forthcoming book will be published by E. P. Dutton.

all of which have become associated in one way or another with "New Drama," such as the Living Theatre and the Performance Group[7] both of which were interested, through the theories of Artaud and Grotowski, in re-establishing the full sensory life in theatrical performance, and in "unblocking" the various psychological inhibitions which hindered them from unification, living and performing as communal groups.[8] The emphasis on community and the willingness of performers to play the roles of the opposite sex (another indication of the process at play) seem microcosmic analogies to the philosophy of "comprehensive living" outlined below.

Before leaving these topics, it should be mentioned that the new involvement in mixed media, sensitivity training, group therapy, and living as drama (the work of Erving Goffman is relevant) has resulted in a strong interest in multi-media teaching "as well as a strong tendency toward the fusion of group therapy and psychodrama with classroom teaching. One of "Cassirer College's" founding faculty members has written:

> Teaching, as most of us know it and have known it, is rather like proscenium theatre with a clear line drawn between art and life; audience and performance. But, unlike traditional theatre, the classroom situation does not have the saving grace of illusion, the willing suspension of disbelief, the projection or introjection of a self and world freer than the self-in-society that we recreate in drama. We have had audience and performance, but little interaction. We have had, in some sense, a theatre of censorship. The performer teacher as authority figure, consciously or unconsciously, denies by role the very dynamism, process and conflict inherent in the classroom. In order to oppose these tendencies, this stasis, I have tried a number of strategies and techniques in the service of freedom.[9]

Such tendencies will have to be considered by those planning future curricula for the preparation of media teachers.

2. The work of Levi-Strauss directs anthropology toward a general theory of relationships, and focuses on what the relationships communicate. In his Postscript to chapters III and IV in *Structural Anthropology*, he points out that the study of one language leads inevitably to general linguistics but also involves us in the study of all forms of communication, a development which Haudricourt and Granai, whose article he is commenting upon, call a Copernican revolution. He continues:

> Without reducing society or culture to language, we can initiate this "Copernican revolution," which will consist of interpreting society as a whole in terms of a theory of communication. This endeavor is possible on three levels; since the rules of kinship and marriage serve to insure the circulation of women between groups, just as economic rules serve to insure the circulation of goods and services, and linguistic rules the circulation of messages.
>
> These three forms of communication are also forms of exchange which are obviously interrelated (because marriage relations are associated with economic prestations, and language comes into play at all levels). It is therefore legitimate to seek homologies between them and define the formal characteristics of each one considered independently and of the transformations which make the transition possible from one to another.[10]

Students of literature are already applying Lévi-Strauss's ideas to myth and we can expect this interest to extend to media structures and their messages, a movement which should be welcomed since it interweaves with rather than isolates the study of media from the study of culture.

---

[7] This movement is chronicled in the issues of the *Tulane Drama Review* (now *The Drama Review*).

[8] These groups are also interested in dreams, myth, ritual, and games, relating them to the anthropological concerns treated next, and to McLuhan's chapter on games in *Understanding Media*. See Peter Brook, *The Empty Space* (New York: Atheneum, 1968), Chapter 2; Jerzy Grotowski, *Towards a Poor Theatre* (Denmark: Odin Teatrets Forlag, 1968); Richard Schechner, *Public Domain: Essays on the Theatre* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969).

[9] A useful bibliography appears in Calvin W. Taylor and Frank E. Williams (eds.), *Instructional Media and Creativity* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966).

[10] The quotation is from H. R. Wolf's position paper, "New Techniques in Education," one of the strategies is described in his essay "Teaching and Group Dynamics: The Paradox of Freedom", forthcoming in *Radical Teacher*.

[11] Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology* (New York: Doubleday, 1967), p. 82. See also Tim Moore, *Claude Lévi-Strauss and the Cultural Sciences*, Occasional Papers No. 4, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Birmingham University (1968).

> "Concerned with the interest in man's inner resources has been a developing understanding of his relationship to the material resources of his environment, especially through studies in ecology and futurism. Ecology teaches that man lives as one type of animal in a landscape containing many other animals, plants, birds, trees, streams, ponds, and mountains. To quote C. H. Waddington:
>
> This whole complex forming landscape is not a mere jumbled agglomeration of separate items—so many pine trees, so many birds of this species, so many of that, so many worms, or sheep or what have you. It is a community, depending on an organized network of all kinds of relationships, of eater, eaten, or parasite or host, fillers of the soil like earthworms which prepare the land for plants to grow in, bacteria and molds which decompose dead bodies and a multitude of other necessary actors in the total scene." Waddington believes the basic unit of ecological studies to be energy and the activities capable of processing it in the forms in which it appears within a given ecological setup. He continues:
>
> The wisdom of living things inhabiting any area on the surface of the world is ultimately sustained only by the energy poured into it by the sun. The whole future of interactions which converts that assemblage of living things into a real community, should be understandable in terms of ways in which this basic "income" is parceled out, handed on from one individual to another (by being eaten, for instance), converted into foreign currencies which the recipient cannot use. . . .

His focus on the continuing transformation of energy within a community relates ecology, understood in this sense, to Buckminster Fuller's World Resources Inventory at Southern Illinois University and John McHale's Center for Integrative Studies within the School of Advanced Technology at the State University of New York at Binghamton.[1] The last of a six-volume set called *World Design Science Decade 1965–1975*, on which Fuller and McHale collaborated, is *The Ecological Context: Energy and Materials*, a detailed exposition of the second phase of the ten-year program which treats the topic of world energy and materials usage within the overall context of global ecology. One of the most basic concepts of Fuller's *Comprehensive Thinking* (Volume 3) is that man's intelligence is part of nature and that all activities flowing from it are part of the evolutionary process. His total systems-approach to designing the future relates the human biophysical, psychosocial, and technological systems to the environ's atmospheric, terrestrial (lithospheric), and oceanic (hydrospheric) systems. McHale writes:

> We need to extend the physical and biological concepts of ecology to include the social behaviors of man—as critical factors in the maintenance of his dynamic ecological balance. Nature is not only modified by human action as manifested in science and technology—through physical transformations of the earth to economic purpose—but also by those factors, less amenable to direct perception and measure, which are political-ethical systems, education, needs for social contiguity and communication, art, religion, etc. Such "socio-cultural" factors have played and will continue to play a considerable role in man's forward evolutionary trending and its effects on the overall ecology of earth."[2]

The final embed of "communication, art"—media studies—will be within this "overall ecology of earth." McHale's references to economics and religion remind us that the contemporary reorganization of the world's economic resources—the war on poverty, aid to underdeveloped countries—runs parallel to the attempted reunification of man's traditional spiritual resources in the ecumenical movement. Economic and ecumenical share a common Greek root with ecological—OIKOS, a house. All are studies in housekeeping and aim at making of the world a home. If Ezra Pound is right, that "beauty is seeing all the relationships," aesthetic

---

[1] R. Buckminster Fuller, review of Shepard and McKinley (eds.), *The Subversive Science: Essays Toward an Ecology of Man* in *The New York Times Book Review* (April 20, 1969), 42.

[2] Fuller's latest book is *Operating Manual for Spaceship Earth* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969) and McHale's is *The Future of the Future* (New York: George Braziller, 1969). Related documents are Jon Diegos's syllabus, "Design of Alternative Futures," published as the seventh issue of the *Journal of Environmental Design*, and *The Whole Earth Catalogue* and *The Difficult But Possible Supplement to the Whole Earth Catalogue* (Menlo Park, California: Portolo Institute, 1968).

[3] John McHale, *The Ecological Context: Energy and Materials* (Carbondale, Illinois: World Resources Inventory, 1965), p. 23. See also his "Global Ecology: Toward the Planetary Society," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 11 (1968), 29–33. This entire issue, edited by Robert Strauss-Hupé, was devoted to "Society and Ecology."

education will be the study of this evolutionary process of total planetary interaction as an art form. The arts and sciences would be joined and man's learning would lead toward his wholeness.

[From Screen, Summer 1971]

The American Film Institute

(By Richard Thompson)

After three and one-half years of operation, the American Film Institute is the focus of controversy flowing from administrative and policy decisions taken in January 1971. What follows is a review and critique of the AFI's history. I have tried to make clear my relationship to those events.

Many members of the film community have withheld comment on the AFI issue because insufficient information was available to them. Perhaps this report will provide a useful basis for dialogue between the AFI management and the national constituency it should serve.

CREATION OF THE AFI

The United States was the last great film-producing nation to initiate a national film institute. With a combination of Federal Government and private funding ($1.2 million each from the Federal Government's National Endowment for the Humanities, the Ford Foundation, the Motion Picture Association of America, and private sources), the AFI was officially founded in June 1967. Other agencies have long performed film institutional duties, the Library of Congress, the Museum of Modern Art, the George Eastman House, colleges, universities, film societies, publications, and private individuals.

On December 19, 1966, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities announced:

. . . the establishment of an American Film Institute, thus formally activating the recommendation of President Lyndon B. Johnson made on the occasion of the signing of the Arts and Humanities Bill on September 29, 1965.

The Film Advisory Council will provide guidance during the preparation of the final report of the Stanford Research Institute, whose comprehensive study on the organization and location of the American Film Institute is scheduled to be completed by mid-February of 1967. Other members of the Film Advisory Council (in addition to Roger Stevens and Gregory Peck) are: Elizabeth Ashley, actress; Sherrill Corwin, president, National Association of Theatre Owners; John Culkin, SJ, director, Center for Communications, Fordham University; Bruce Herschensohn, Herschensohn Motion Picture Productions and producer of USIA's recent film on the late President Kennedy; Charlton Heston, actor; David Mallery, Director of Studies, National Association of Independent Schools; William L. Pereira, Los Angeles architect; Arnold Picker, executive vice-president, United Artists Corporation; Sidney Poitier, actor; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., historian; George Seaton, writer-director-producer; George Stevens, Sr., director-producer; George Stevens, Jr., director, Motion Picture and Television Service, U.S. Information Agency; Jack Valenti, president, Motion Picture Association of America; Richard Walsh, president, International Alliance of Theatrical and Stage Employees.

All save George Stevens, Sr. and Charlton Heston became Trustees of the AFI. Heston serves on an advisory committee to the AFI Board of Trustees.

INITIAL CONTROVERSY

In *Readers & Writers*, April-May 1967, Cecile Starr, noted film teacher and editor of *Ideas on Film*, addressed an open letter to Gregory Peck:

Many professional film people—film teachers, film librarians, film society representatives, film students, independent film-makers, and 16mm distributors, among others—feel that those who are shaping the AFI do not know what they are doing or where they are going. We fear that the Hollywood-dominated Advisory Council does not clearly recognize the difference between film art and film entertainment. In its years of plenty, Hollywood showed very little interest in raising the level of public appreciation of film as an art; in helping schools and colleges teach the art of the film and film-making; and in encouraging film

artists to work freely toward experimenting with and advancing the art of the motion picture. Hollywood should be represented on the committee, but why as a majority?

She then invoked the Arts Council's obligation to concern itself with film as a fine art, and to decide whether it will be controlled by the industry or by people more directly involved with film as an art . . .".

Does the Film Advisory Council represent the people and institutions concerned with film as an art?

Of the sixteen-member committee, four (yourself included) are distinguished Hollywood actors; two are distinguished Hollywood producer-directors; two are distinguished producers of government-sponsored films; four are distinguished representatives of the producers, exhibitors and employees of the film industry; one is a distinguished architect; one a distinguished historian-politician and part-time film critic; and two are distinguished representatives of the film-teaching profession whose writings indicate a strong predilection for Hollywood films.

Why does the Advisory Council not include a representative of the film society movement; of some of the large and small universities where film-making has been taught for five to twenty years; of non-Hollywood, non-governmental film-makers to whom we must inevitably look for our next generation of film artists? Why are film historians, familiar with the long-standing conflict between film artists and film businessmen, and film critics not included on the Advisory Council? And why are there no representatives of our film libraries in museums, universities and public libraries throughout the country?

Supposedly one reason for overlooking them is that they might become recipients of grants from the Arts Council. This hardly holds up, however, in light of the fact that Father John Culkin, a member of the Film Advisory Council, has received $71,000 for a project he is to undertake in connection with Fordham University. Surely there are other people, currently engaged in other aspects of film art, who can be counted to serve the Advisory Council with similar selflessness.

Can any lasting and vital activities result from such unplanned planning, such closed-circle operations, such one-sided representations?

Will the $50,000 study made by the Stanford Research Institute, 'to develop a plan for a national film institute', be made public?

If the Film Advisory Council had been more representatively composed, it would have been in a better position to develop its own plan for a national film institute rather than delegate this job to a research group relatively unfamiliar with film art.

Miss Starr then listed many classic films and standard works of film history and aesthetics, wondering how many members of the Advisory Council had seen or read them; then

Where else other than in the US would an educator dare open a national conference on the teaching of film as an art by remarking that he was not a film specialist and had never seen Eisenstein's *Potemkin*—'not even the famous steps sequence'? In what other country in the world would such innocently professed ignorance lead to government subsidies for further conferences on film art, and eventually to a permanent place on the National Council on the Arts as its expert on the motion picture? With all the money in the world, with all the good intentions in the world, we do not believe that film art can be advanced one whit in this country without the open and coordinated assistance of everyone in this country who is concerned with film as an art.

Interviewed in *Variety* (April 17, 1967) on what she felt should be done, Miss Starr said:

To start with, I'd throw out the whole present Advisory Council. I'm not asking anyone to agree with my ideas for the American Film Institute, but let's put together a Council of recognized leaders in the arts, people whose concern for film could result in a workable plan for the American Film Institute.

She then provided a list of possible candidates.

Variety (April 24, 1967) devoted most of a page to AFI coverage. A news story noted that a board of trustees would be established. Jack Valenti was quoted as saying that no more than 5 per cent of the board would be major company representatives.*

*A separate story summarized an editorial by William Starr (no relation) in the American Federation of Film Society's journal *Film Society Review*, which echoed earlier criticism regarding Board composition, non-representation of non-industry constituencies, and decisions made in which those groups and interests with most at stake had neither representation nor participation. 'The fear widely exists that the country may shortly be faced with a vested interest organizational *fait accompli* which will require years of devoted labour to undo.'

Gregory Peck responded to the issues raised by Cecile Starr by sidestepping them.

'Her remarks are intemperate. She's badly informed in the stand she's taken.' He was then paraphrased at length on the research the Advisory Council undertook.

It's designed to provide a bridge to films, and without Miss Starr probably being aware of it, is just about what she would like it to be.' He added that what it boils down to is that the Council isn't composed of members Miss Starr (or Mr. Starr – Ed) would like to see on it.

'We feel we have done an objective job,' said Peck, 'and our whole aim is to provide new opportunities' for young entrants into the field. 'We feel it was wise to have conducted our research without the glare of publicity.'

While castigating Miss Starr for being misinformed, he continued to withhold the information necessary for a well-informed discussion of the issues at hand. The AFI continues to meet such attempts at dialogue with an assurance that things are going well, without details on what is going well or how it is going well or why or where it's going, often coupled, as here, with a mild personal attack on the challenger. The AFI spent the three and one-half years after Peck's statement operating mainly 'without the glare of publicity', or, to be plain, largely in secret.

Cecile Starr responded to Peck's answer in *Variety* (June 7, 1967): Gregory Peck's statement that my remarks are 'intemperate' and that I'm 'badly informed' on the stand I've taken, seem to me to sidestep the issues I've tried to call to his attention.

My stand is that the sixteen-member Film Advisory Council of the National Council on the Arts, which Peck heads, cannot possibly advance film as an *art* since the great majority of its members have had little or no experience with motion pictures except as a business for profit or for propaganda purposes. That their intentions may be the best I readily concede (a concession which Peck does not seem to grant to mine). But my good will is stretched to its limit when I hear that the leading contender for the position of director of the proposed American Film Institute is at present a political appointee, and that he will be (or has been) chosen by a Council which includes himself, his father, representatives of the Hollywood film industry in which his father is a prominent figure, and representatives of his political party, including a former employee of the office which he now heads.

Variety commented editorially:

Gregory Peck's quip in Washington on Monday (5) that the AFI was 'reviewed' before the curtain went up does not answer nor dismiss the objections and fears of those who wanted to be heard, and were not. The Institute has been established on the basis of unreported discussions and an unpublished report of the Stanford Research outfit. It is not that the Institute will not proceed to serve useful purposes, but that it has made a mystery of its reasons, which is never good public relations.

The same issue of *Variety* cited AFI's goals in the areas of film-maker training, film education, film production, preservation and cataloguing (archives), and publications. Of these five, film education and publication are vague programmes:

Film education (primarily to explore ways to assist 'development and improvement').

Publications (including more and better textbooks on film-making).

When established, the Board of Trustees included Ashley, Corwin, Culkin, Herschensohn, Mallery, Pereira, Picker, Poitier, Seaton, and Valenti from the Advisory Council; also named were 16mm distributor Charles Benton; writer-director Francis Ford Coppola; former US Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel; film-maker Richard Leacock; Group W TV syndication president Donald McGannon; writer Dan Taradash; and director Fred Zinneman.

George Stevens, Jr. was appointed Director of the AFI. Stevens is, of course, the son of the noted Hollywood director. From his official AFI press biography:

Stevens began his career in films during college as an assistant on *A Place in the Sun* and *Shane*. Following two years as a motion picture officer in the US Air Force, he directed a number of television shows including *Alfred Hitchcock Presents* and *Peter Gunn*. He was an associate producer on *The Diary of*

Anne Frank and also directed location segments of that film. In 1962 the late Edward R. Murrow selected him to head the Motion Picture Division of the United States Information Agency.*

An article in the June 9 issue of *Variety* gave Stevens' defence of the AFI:

Absolutely everybody who's criticized the Institute either for what it will or won't be doing, is dead wrong, he suggested, since even daddy [himself] doesn't have a clear idea of what it's going to be when it grows up.

Precisely what Cecile Starr had said five months earlier!

The article gave Stevens' description of a wide range of specific alternatives in the areas of archives, production, and film-maker training; and then:

The three areas above, which are likely to account for the major portion of the Institute's three-year budget, have also occupied the bulk of Stevens' time in the brief period since he's been installed in office, and rather than being discouraged that he hasn't found the answers, he appears pleased that in so short a time he's uncovered the questions. But in two other areas, film education and publications, he suggests that he hasn't found time to really explore the problems.

At this point in the story, John Culkin speaks for these areas, suggesting that, in time, the AFI Education Department might involve itself in a teacher-training programme, a curriculum study, and in providing textbooks, but that the big effort would centre on 'spreading the word' of the film education movement, at primary and secondary levels. *This limited view, omitting as it does the possibility of leadership and creativity in the education field, has hovered over AFI's educational efforts since, as we shall see, such efforts have been primarily in the areas of organisation, and of data collection and distribution. These are responsive, administrative areas, not initiative, creative ones.*

AFI's first promotional piece was a handsome, lavishly illustrated pamphlet which describes AFI's 'response to needs in several areas of film':

Preservation and Archives: To preserve, catalogue and provide for the increased accessibility of outstanding American films.

Education: To develop in America the most discerning and responsive film audience possible, through the improvement of film study methods and support of teacher education in film.

Film-maker Training: To encourage and accelerate the development of professional artists in the field of film.

Production: To create additional opportunities in film production for talented new film makers and developing professionals.

Publications: To stimulate excellence in research and writing about all aspects of motion pictures and television.

These are then developed in greater detail. The Education section is titled 'The Film Audience'; AFI's rhetoric in discussing education consistently focuses on an 'audience' which can be improved by distribution of data and support of the primary and secondary school film education movement. The Santa Barbara Conference, advisory service and newsletter, and fellowships for graduate degree candidates are the only programmes listed. 'In these ways it is hoped that film will be furthered by its inevitable critic—the audience.'

Publications. Next to films themselves, published materials may constitute the most significant means of stimulating progress in the art of film. The literature of the American film, despite important individual accomplishments, does not presently provide sufficient intellectual base for the advancement of film as art.

---

*One of the striking things about the AFI is the presence of ex-United States Information Agency people in key positions. Richard Kahlenberg, who was one of the first people appointed to the staff and is currently the AFI's Assistant Director for Planning, had previously worked for the United States Information Agency as an assistant cultural attaché. Robert Goodman, who became the number two man at the AFI in 1968, had previously been assistant director of the United States Information Agency. Antonio Vellani, who became responsible for the grants to film-maker's programme, had been on the staff of the United States Information Agency when Stevens headed it.

Articles in *Film Comment* (vol 5, no 2, and vol 4, nos 2 and 3) contain a good deal of information about the United States Information Agency. The latter issue documents Stevens's decision to make a United States Information Agency feature documentary on John Kennedy upon the President's assassination; it also discusses the extraordinary use and distribution of the film *Years of Lightning, Day of Drums* and the assignment of all domestic profits from the film to the John F. Kennedy Centre for the Performing Arts. Roger L. Stevens (no relation), chairman of the Board of the Kennedy Centre, appointed the film's producer, George Stevens, Jr., its writer-director, Bruce Herschensohn (later successor to Stevens in heading United States Information Agency film activities), and its narrator, Gregory Peck, to the original sixteen man Film Advisory Council to create an American Film Institute. This Advisory Council was a part of the National Endowment for the Arts, of which Roger Stevens was then chairman.

The publications division of AFI will seek to stimulate research and writing about all aspects of film, especially but not exclusively the American film, by writers and scholars the world over. The Institute will contribute to the literature of film in several ways. By establishing a motion picture magazine, a literate, lively periodical designed for everyone with a serious interest in film and the film industry. By cooperating in the publication of books on the history and aesthetics of film and on the achievements of individual artists—books of particular use in colleges and universities and to the interested public. By producing films about film. By developing a programme of oral history, to record past and present accomplishments of film artists. By identifying research needs in all areas of the American film, in cooperation with universities, film societies, museums and other agencies devoted to film research. By reproducing film scripts for use in training courses, to permit analysis of the problems of written style and visual form in the film.

While every art in the end survives by its own achievements, every art also in due course creates a literature which sustains and guides its developments. One of AFI's goals is a comprehensive literature of film, providing audiences with an opportunity to appreciate the medium more fully and young film makers a chance to learn from those who have gone before.

A repertory programme is generally described, aiding in the availability and circulation of prints among theatres, exhibitors, film societies, etc; no mention of a national film theatre is made.

IMPLEMENTATION

It would be impractical to cover the history of the AFI in detail. I will attempt to summarise major steps in the Institute's development, with closer attention given to the areas at issue, Education and Publications, research and scholarship. In examining the following programmes and decisions, it must be borne in mind that while mandates and responsibilities have been passed down to middle management (programme managers and officers), authority to make decisions is consequently difficult to assign.

In its first year, the AFI allocated $1.2 million to the Archives programme for nitrate print rescue and preservation. This has been the most successful AFI programme; it has also operated with the greatest independence from top management, possibly because it is the only programme of the five major programmes managed by an Assistant Director of the Institute. The AFI also sponsored or co-sponsored conferences on film and education during its first year. It established a $500,000 production fund for grants to independent film-makers, new and old; this programme, too, has been quite successful in fulfilling its goals. Future film production plans were announced, but because these plans underwent considerable changes before realisation, they will be described later. The National Film Catalogue project was commenced, linking the Archive staff with the Library of Congress to computerise credit data for all films produced in the U.S., a mammoth undertaking now nearly finished; this, too, has been a successful and useful project. A Film Information Service for educators and scholars was initiated in New York City. Although it has been closed, a long-term lease requires the AFI to continue to pay a rental estimated at $250,000 per year for the unused office. Planning began for the Center for Advanced Film Studies, to be located in Los Angeles. Richard Kahlenberg was placed in charge of basic planning for the Center, which would be the AFI's most ambitious and expensive effort; he was replaced as archives head by Sam Kula. An oral history programme was begun, operating from the UCLA Film Department, funded jointly by the AFI and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Mid-year 1968, Robert Geller was named head of the Education Department, assisted by Education officers Ron Sutton (later to succeed Geller upon his resignation in 1969) and Kit Laybourne. In July, AFI's Santa Barbara Leadership Conference for film educators began. It was a four-week session for forty teachers in close informal contact with film-makers, university film professors, industry representatives, and so on. 'It is planned to publish the papers and curricula developed' from seminars and workshops held during the Conference, the AFI announced. Though Kit Laybourne prepared extensive report material on this key conference, the AFI chose not to publish it. Instead, a small, anonymous promotional pamphlet entitled 'The First American Film Institute Leadership Seminar: Teaching the Film' appeared. It is a summary of the structure of the Conference, a list of the visiting faculty, and a survey of AFI's projected Model Site Funding project. It does not deal with specific results of the Conference, and could have been written before the event.

In September, the Education Department announced Education Fellowships of $1,500 for MA candidates, $2,500 for PhD candidates—up to ten to be awarded as the 'first step toward increasing the number of teachers'. Actually it was one of AFI's very few steps to directly support young film scholars and critics in their work. After its first year, it was discontinued. In November 1968 the department announced the first of its Model Site grants, thirteen in all, advancing some funding to develop film education programmes and curricula around the country. The project was discontinued after its second year.

In February 1969 the Oral History Project was transferred from the UCLA Film Department to AFI proper; the Louis B. Mayer Foundation grant of $150,000 over three years made it possible. James R. Silke was made head of the project. Silke was the founder and former editor of *Cinema*, and the later editor of *Movies International*, *The Real West*, and *Assault*. The first projects commissioned were the oral histories Peter Bogdanovich completed with Leo McCarey and Allan Dwan; oral histories of William Wellman and Mervyn LeRoy and Busby Berkeley were commissioned; none of these has been completed though their deadlines are past.

In the *Journal of Aesthetic Education* (vol. 3, no. 3, July 1969) Robert Geller and Sam Kula published an 'article developed in consultation with Mr. George Stevens, Jr., entitled "Toward Filmic Literacy: the role of the American Film Institute". The article is probably the most articulate and scholarly presentation of AFI programmes and their goals that has appeared.

Under the heading 'The Need for Enlightened Film Education', they note: 'The principal concern is about who teaches what to whom and how it is taught. A cautionary summary of destructive tendencies in American film education follows, then... But as an art form films must be understood as objects providing opportunities primarily for aesthetic experience.' Later: 'It is not, of course, AFI's function to establish inflexible aesthetic principles.' Discussing the Center for Advanced Film Studies: 'The Center is intended to serve as a bridge between film study and film making as a profession.' 'A major goal of such a programme is to create an ambiance for fruitful discourse on film.' As had been customary, they note: 'The Center will also accept a limited number of fellows pursuing careers as film critics and historians.' The role of those critics and scholars within the Center, and the AFI, is undefined. Many other topics are covered, including the films-on-film series, initiated with Bogdanovich's documentary on John Ford. (Due to extreme schedule and budget over-runs, and unforeseen difficulties encountered in obtaining releases for film clips, this film has not yet been completed, and further film-on-film are not planned at this time.)

II. Second Year

In July 1969 the AFI issued its first annual report, a thirty-two-page pamphlet with a high picture-to-copy ratio. *Variety* remarked, pinpointing a common AFI press characteristic: 'Of all the items reviewed in the annual report of the AFI issued last week, only in one area was any "hard news" revealed.' They were referring to the naming of the five individuals who received screen-writing grants. The report itself reviews most areas without adding much new data. In the area of publications, it promises:

> ... to publish *American Film*, a magazine that will deal with the past, present and future of the cinema. Special attention will be devoted to the ideas, methods and words of those who have made and are now making films. Fact will be emphasized over opinion, with the aim of providing a continuing source of information and experienced thought about the craft, the art, the economics—about all the factors which make film-making what it is. [Note the crude polarisation of the critical process between 'fact' and 'opinion'.] AFI will work with publishing houses and writers to encourage the publication of books and monographs about all aspects of film-making and film history.

When Chloe Aaron interviewed research fellows after the January upheaval, Greg Ford remembered that she had an AFI budget summary which contained a $50,000 item for the *American Film* project, which had been assigned to Jim Silke, currently Editorial Director in charge of publications. The project has been discontinued and written off as a loss. This write-off figure is approximately equal to the entire Production costs figure listed for all British Film Institute publications for the year ending March 31, 1970.

With the services of the top-flight publicity agent firm, John Springer Associates (representatives of the Burtons, Henry Fonda, *Satyricon*, *Z*, etc.), the

AFI augmented its many pamphlets and press releases. The cost has unofficially been cited as a retainer of $20,000 per annum, plus per job fees and expenses above that. This was in addition to a full-time staff member in Washington assigned to public relations—apparently at $12,000 per year.

At the end of July, *Filmfacts* became an official AFI publication. It is in line with the AFI's emphasis on data, rather than opinion. The periodical publishes the credits of all commercial features released in the U.S. and includes a selection from daily and weekly reviews.

In the same month, the Center for Advanced Film Studies opened. There were eighteen Fellows (11½ in Research, rather than the three solicited) and a faculty consisting of full-time members Frantisek Daniel, James Blue, Jim Kitses; part-time member Jim Silke. Kitses was given the Center Research Department responsibilities; he hired me from Chicago to work with him.

The Center is located in an old Beverly Hills mansion, rented for $1 per year from the city, but requiring renovation, adaptation, equipment, and mansion-scale staff and maintenance totalling over $1 million. Many films are screened there for Fellows, and most Fellows are in some stage of film-making, for the most part Scenario writing or re-writing. Production equipment and facilities are limited.

Center faculty in general were unconcerned with, or by, the chaotic lack of programme, organisation, or structure given to events and screenings at the Center. Ultimately, the Research Department was able to make some progress in this area, but generally without active support from other areas of the Center. At the end of the first academic year, Blue resigned; the AFI did not replace this key faculty position, combining, as Blue did, first-hand film-making knowledge with critical experience and teaching insight. In fact, with twice as many Fellows at the Center, the AFI began its second year with a smaller faculty than that of its first year. Apparently, it will begin its third year with an even smaller faculty, as Kitses has not been replaced. Stevens is always listed as a faculty member, but he performs no specific faculty functions. He spends roughly half his time at the Center. The rest is spent in Washington or travelling, fund raising, and so on.

In its 1971–72 academic year brochure for the Center, the AFI announced that tuition will be $2,500 (which will be waived if a means test demonstrates inability to pay—somewhat similar to scholarship procedures in other academic institutions). With the advent of tuition, it is interesting to compare the Center to other advanced film training centres. Unlike others, the Center is not accredited and so cannot grant degrees. Nor does it give grades, offer courses or formal curriculum. It has a faculty (for forty-odd Fellows and at least half as many auditors) which consists of Frantisek Daniel, academic head of the Center and full-time faculty; Tony Vellani, most of whose time is occupied with the Film-maker Grant and Production programmes he has charge of; and Jim Silke, who, on a half-time basis, is in charge of the AFI's Publications and Research programmes as well as arranging for the guest appearance-seminars which occur roughly once a week. By addition of fractions, nearly two full-time faculty members for forty Fellows; at $2,500, it's no bargain.

At the end of 1969, Stevens announced the opening of the AFI Theatre in Washington, 'to stimulate interest in the cinema, and to enlarge the number of Washington's discerning filmgoers by calling attention to great films of different eras'. Eight months later, the Theatre moved to the L'Enfant Plaza complex, an 800-seat theatre which *Variety* said had already 'failed as a commercial outlet, partly because it is off the beaten track'. AFI Theatre memberships were available first for $5, then $10 ($7 for students) per year. Membership confers these privileges: one receives schedules and mailing list material, and pays $1.25 admission to screenings. No participation or vote. The AFI claimed 7,000 memberships for the Theatre, a revenue of $70,000 at $10 per member; yet the Theatre is currently running at a deficit the AFI itself estimates to be approximately $100,000 per year—for a strictly local-impact, Washington area programme.

FOCUS

By June of 1969, the AFI's estimate was that it had been successful in looking after film-makers and their films, in programmes such as production and grants, film-maker training (with the Center for Advanced Studies about to open), and archives; but had not yet found its stride in the areas of dissemination or appreciation—by which words the AFI meant education, publications, research, and scholarly activities aimed at the world of ideas. At this point,

42-830—74——9

thinking seemed to embrace the notion that if the AFI is for the artist and his works more than for the audience (in practice), it should lead from that strength. Indeed, as the Center, Production Department, and Archives already served the film-maker, Publication, Education, and the AFI Theatre should do the same. This crucial turn of ideas, centring all AFI conceptual thinking on the film-maker primarily and explicitly, underlies many of AFI's later difficulties.

EDUCATION

1969 was the Education Department's peak year in terms of staff, funding and activity. During this year it reached a staff size of seven (exclusive of interlocking support from Research—a staff of three)—a department manager, two officers, and four assistants. The year before, Education created the Community Film Workshop Council with a $50,000 seed grant; this has proved to be a good investment, maintaining vigorous activity and finding other funding for the ensuing years, mostly under the guidance of Geller, who headed CFWC after resigning as AFI Education manager. At the end of 1968, Education Membership was established. Through 1969 and 1970, it came to include over 2,000 teachers in the field, serving as the centre of an information and organisational network. The goals of the Membership plan were:

(1) To establish a national clearing house for information and curricula; (2) to provide consultation and advisory service; (3) to provide an official liaison with other national education groups; (4) to act as a stimulus to regional and local film study organisations; and (5) to become a news link for sharing important film education activities within the country.

Education Members were solicited most heavily and receptively for feedback, information, and suggestions, but, as with other AFI membership programmes, Education Members paid a yearly fee but had no voting power or status within the AFI administration.

The Fall 1970 *Newsletter* carried Ron Sutton's new view of the Department's function, probably necessitated by shrinking funds and staff (by this time, the staff had shrunk to Sutton, the manager, Dispenza, the field officer, Greensfelder, assistant, and possibly one more secretary. Membership price rose from $6 to $10 with no increase in benefits: members received the *Newsletter*, *Membership Directory, and Guide to College Film Courses*).

but we tend now to think of our work for the seventies primarily as a need-surveying, information-sharing lobby for film education. The vast and complex needs in the field argue against our attempting to meet them through direct funding such as film study grants). We see our role as a catalyst in the field. It seems appropriate that we concentrate on convincing leaders in business, foundations, government and education that film study needs strong, solid financial assistance.

In addition, he listed information exchange, summer schools, and aid to groups wishing to stage their own regional screenings—the AFI had discontinued its regional screening activities.

In February of 1970, Sutton outlined the three basic education field needs the AFI would attempt to service (under reduced staff and funding support): 1. development of some understanding of what film study is, particularly important in high schools, where film courses are largely offered through English or Humanities departments; 2. Leadership courses, "with more film courses in higher education, we need more trained people to teach them"; 3. Materials—films and print materials.

RESEARCH 1970

For the Center's second academic year, the Research Department accepted three Research Fellows, which gave a total of 4½ with the 1½ remaining second-year Research Fellows. This group, along with an actively involved staff and some other interested Fellows, began screenings in support of Research Fellows' projects, began a weekly critical seminar presented by a different person in the Department each time, and, in January, began to develop some group publication projects. At this time, Kitses was finishing a book-length report on the summer seminar. Three research auditors had been selected to join the group at the end of the month.

FEATURE

In late May 1970, when the coming financial crisis of the AFI had been foreseen by top management and there was considerable uncertainty about whether money would be available to open the Center the following October for Fellows

who had already been accepted, the AFI moved into the production of a feature film. Reasons for this decision have not been made public, or clear. The film by Center Fellow Stanton Kaye, titled *In Pursuit of Treasure*, was finally budgeted at $130,000, which the AFI apparently provided. At that time, many within the AFI considered the budget extremely low. To date, the film has cost $260,000. Much of the overage was covered by companies of some Trustees. It appears that completion cost will be over $300,000.

III. Blow Up

In October 1970 David Lunney was hired at $22,000 to become (administrative) manager of the Center. His background was not in film, but in theatrical management. He also worked for the Ford Foundation. Early in the week of January 18, 1971, he fired Marie Fitch, a secretary, under highly questionable circumstances. Staff relations have never been good at the AFI; this firing united the staff, all of whom attended the regularly scheduled staff meeting the day after the firing and asked for an explanation of the firing. At that time staff also read a document which had been under preparation for three weeks previously, listing grievances and suggesting changes. The staff meeting lasted a day and a half, at the end of which Marie Fitch was allowed to exercise an earlier-approved transfer to another department, rather than remain fired. Staff expressed their hope that this would open up new and more successful staff relations; the tone at the end of the meeting was positive.

Management Responds

The following day, Friday, January 22, summarily, without warning or consultation, by David Lunney, Steven Manes, library assistant, was fired; his supervisor, librarian Anne Schlosser, was called into the session as an afterthought; Richard Thompson, Research manager, and Jeryll Taylor, Research Coordinator, were fired together; and Jim Kitses, Director of Critical Studies at the Center and full faculty member, was fired.

We were told at the firings that we were being fired due to budget tightness. Later, the AFI maintained it had foreseen these trims for several months. However, they had not been discussed with department heads and administrators involved, nor had any warning been given to personnel, and at one stroke AFI's research and critical studies department was removed.

Many saw the firings as an example to the staff to stay in line or suffer the consequences, since two of those dismissed had been active in the Marie Fitch affair.

Overlapping these firings, Stevens conducted a hastily arranged meeting in his office with some Production Fellows—but no Research Fellows—at which some explanation for the firings was given; content of that meeting has not been made public. By 7:00 pm the same evening, Bill Scott, production manager of the Center, moved his resignation up to be effective immediately, in protest. Saturday and Sunday, Stevens, Kahlenberg, Lunney, Daniel, Silke and Vellani worked long hours at the Center, holding meetings with Fellows and staff, consolidating their position and smoothing things over.

Research Fellows' Response

On Monday morning, the Research Fellows distributed the following 'Appeal to Our Fellow Fellows' to the Film-making, Screenwriting, Camera, and Production Fellows:

1. We no longer feel there is a place for us and the critical study we embody at the Center. It has been suggested that we continue as Felows without either specific staff or tasks under the part-time guidance of faculty members who have not been previously involved with the Research Department. We do not feel that the committed, vital work of Jim Kitses can be replaced by present staff, and we therefore cannot accept the proposed spineless, vapid program.

2. We feel that the dismissed Research Department was in fact fulfilling the true, stated goals of the Center in that it was a genuine community for film study and education. We furthermore believe that George Stevens, Richard Kahlenberg, and David Lunney, who took this decision, having no meaningful contact with the Research Department, were ill-equipped to accurately assess its true worth. We can only conclude that they were either willfully unaware of the Department's actual accomplishments or chose to reject on principle the critical function of the Center.

3. We find this action appalling both in the specific, high-handed, callous manner in which it was conducted and in the general principle it embodies. We cannot escape the conclusion: In a Center devoted to 'advanced film study', written, carefully argued critical film study no longer has an official place.

4. This action, we also feel, is symptomatic of many similar actions taken by the AFI administration. It is precisely this type of administrative vacillation, duplicity, dilletantism and lack of clear priorities which have stunted the creative growth of the Center from the very start.

Therefore we ask you as fellow Fellows to take these considerations into mind. They will pertain to your future as well as ours. Both official and unofficial discussions of this matter are now taking place. This may be the best and most effective time to make your complaints known. The evolving situation in which the needs of Fellows are being compromised by ineffective administration will eventually affect everyone at the Center.

Kay Loveland, assistant to the head of the Production Department, announced her resignation in protest the same day. The document in which she announced her resignation was the first of several she prepared, at length and in detail, on administrative and staff problems and solutions. They should be consulted separately if possible; they are too long for inclusion here.

The next day, Michael Barlow, programme coordinator, resigned in protest. Thirty-five members of AFI staff, both in Washington, D.C. and California, signed the following statement of solidarity:

We the undersigned members of the staff of the American Film Institute express our solidarity with those recently fired from the AFI, those who have resigned in protest, and the Research Fellows who have lost their department. We find their grievances just and their arguments in the best interest of the AFI. We are committed, as we have always been, to the stated aims of the AFI: production, education, preservation and archives, AFI theatre, film-maker training, publication. We sincerely hope that from this controversy will result a preservation and clarification of those goals.

SPECIAL MEETING

Late that afternoon, Stevens assembled all staff, faculty, Fellows and auditors (except fired or resigned staff) for a meeting. Trustees Gregory Peck, Sidney Barlow (a financier), and Arthur Knight attended, possibly because this open controversy was taking place two weeks before the Board was to meet at Greystone, and four weeks before the National Endowment was to meet at Greystone. Stevens reviewed the history of the AFI at length, then came to the specific issue of the firings. I regret not quoting large chunks from the transcript; they give a good understanding of the AFI's administrative style. In summary, Stevens first said that a staff of forty-four was considered by Ford Foundation and by the AFI to be oversize in support of forty Fellows; the firings were to trim staff down (staff requirements would have been smaller had the AFI not selected a white elephant of a mansion for its California centre; also, it should be noted that four months after the firings 'to reduce staff size', staff size had reached (or passed forty-four once again). Stevens claimed it was obvious to those involved in the decision (not named, but not including most top faculty or staff) that cost reduction would have to take place in personnel. This was not explained either. Regarding the secretary fired, then rehired, Stevens noted that he 'backed Lunney up all the way' (it is typical of AFI's authoritarian administrative style that, given the chance to act for both staff and administrator by stepping in and arbitrating, Stevens chose rather to entrench authority and further alienate staff). Stevens admitted that the decision of who to fire was taken the day after the last staff meeting (wherein two Research Department staff were vocally prominent). Stevens then defended making the decision without consulting the Board by reducing the issue simply to personnel and budget arrangement—ignoring the large-scale structural and policy implications of the decision.

Stevens maintained that Kitses's firing was a mistake, an oversight; in AFI-influenced press coverage, the firing of Kitses was consistently blurred over and in effect denied; apparently after the decision was implemented, someone realised that Kitses's national prominence and stature should have been more subtly considered. Under pressure, Stevens said that Kitses would remain with the AFI as a research grantee, and continue to give seminars for extra payment. He also indicated that this newly released salary money—$12,000 total in

yearly salaries of fired staff—would make staff raises possible, and increase production funds. In the intense question-and-answer period that followed, Stevens was put under direct pressure. When challenged on the point that across-the-board salary cuts at top and middle levels could have retained the severed programmes, Stevens averred that that had been considered, but said no more. Throughout, Stevens continually assumed responsibility for decisions, and invited blame for them if they were bad, but never felt a responsibility to explain those decisions, nor to consider a decision-making structure in which more concerned parties could participate.

KITSES AND SUTTON

On Friday, January 29, Jim Kitses issued a letter to AFI management and staff, Center Fellows, auditors, and faculty, in which he reported:

On Thursday, January 28th, AFI's director, George Stevens, Jr., invited me to discuss these problems. He assured me that the difficulties were a result of misunderstandings, and they had been exploited to damage the AFI. George Stevens also insisted that my dismissal had been a mistake, that some new relationship had been envisaged from the outset of the 'deliberations' that led to this act. This new relationship would have included the Mayer Research Associateship awarded to me some months ago (and scheduled to commence in the fall), plus 'tutoring' and 'special projects'; my salary level ($17,000) would have remained unaffected. This explanation bears no resemblance to what I was told by David Lunney when I was dismissed. In any case, George Stevens made clear that such a relationship was now possible, and urged me to accept it. I have declined and now feel that I must speak out to make clear my reasons.

* * * * * * * *

If AFI staff have taken extreme actions as a result of these precipitate dismissals, it is because they see here the culmination of a pattern of unsatisfactory management-staff relations. This is not the result of malice or mean-spiritedness on the part of management, but flows inevitably from a confused administration that has not expressed to its staff a clear set of aims and priorities. In such a situation, where decisions are improvised and the enemy is always simply a lack of money, the result is that an institution *drifts* rather than has a clear thrust. Cutbacks, the abandonment of programs, dismissals, the dissolution of whole departments—all of these typically imposed from above—demoralize and alienate staff. Having given of themselves in the belief that their contribution is in the best interests of AFI, they suddenly find they or their programs are completely dispensable; quite simply, they feel the victims of the institution.

* * * * * * * *

[George Stevens, Jr.] asked what constructive proposals I could make. . . . I called for the creation of a department within AFI specifically responsible for Education, Research, and Publications. Such a department would have to be funded separately and be directly responsible to a committee, on which AFI Director would serve, consisting of representatives of the film education community. Such a department could spell out a clear program of aims, priorities and deadlines, and work to achieve these. Such a department would also strive to create conditions of employment (and severance), and a fair and rational salary policy—a model that AFI as a whole urgently needs. I expressed my feelings to George Stevens that I would be prepared to work within such a system, the creation of which I took to be essential if the enormous credibility gap that has grown up is to be bridged.

He felt that some of the ideas I had outlined were useful and could be discussed, and that much of this would get done in due course. However, he offered no specific assurances that this kind of radical change in AFI policy and planning would take place. Given the crisis of confidence that now exists, I had no choice but to decline his invitation to continue within the AFI in the ill-defined role he had suggested. This offer seemed an obvious panacea for the immediate situation rather than an attempt to confront the underlying problems.

I do this because of my personal commitment to people and movies, and in the best interests of the AFI. If the American Film Institute can begin to demonstrate—in its programs rather than its press—a core commitment to the creation of a dynamic film culture, I would be grateful for the opportunity to re-join its ranks. As it stands, I have no alternative but to work toward that goal outside it.

Also on Friday, Ron Sutton, AFI Education Director, issued his resignation; this left the Research Department totally without faculty or staff, and the Edu-

cation Department with one officer and one secretary. Sutton's statement begins with an attack on the 'incredible' treatment of persons by AFI management, then echoes Kitses's point that the Education Department was not consulted in the decision to cut away its Research Department interlocking support. He continues:

Furthermore, I remain convinced that this firing was carried forth in an atmosphere of retribution or 'showing of management strength' in relation to the 'Marie Fitch incident'. No conversation I have had with any administrative official has persuaded me otherwise. It is just too large a leap of faith to ask me to believe that this was all coincidental. To be told by the Assistant Director Kahlenberg that this was a well-considered, long-term policy decision, and to discover five minutes later in calling Robert Goodman, the Associate Director and Financial Officer of the Institute, that he knew nothing about the decision really strains the credulity of a twelve-year-old. If it was long-term, then I cry 'foul' because I wasn't consulted. If it was decided and executed hastily as a retaliation for the forced Fitch re-hiring, as I believe it was, then my cry 'foul' is even more appropriate. In any case, I no longer wish to be a party of any kind to such arbitrary and insolent administration.

But a further reason for my decision to leave is that I simply will not stand for yet another weakening of the Institute's work in the areas of education, research, and scholarship. The area has always had the lowest amount of money assigned for its needs, despite the fact that this work relates directly to the largest number of people. I have never been given a firm budget. I have had to make single requests on all items. When I was shown a budget for the Department, it was inaccurate, showing money spent for salaries that was never expended, including grants that never went through the Department, and with no credit given for income received from membership and sale of materials. Complaints about this were always met with the statement that it was being worked on. One and one-half years is a lot of time spent juggling figures. My confidence in the handling of funds and their proper assignment according to the original goals of the Institute has ben strained to the breaking point.

In a joint letter 'To the Educational and Critical Community At Large', Kitses and Sutton warned:

Therefore, we feel compelled to state to the film education and critical community we have worked with over the past years that their interests are no longer represented by the American Film Institute and that for us to continue further as employees of the AFI would only compromise the work we have sought to accomplish.

On January 31, 108 persons involved in film education and research in attendance at the Midwest Film Conference signed a petition addressed to the AFI Board of Trustees. It read:

Because we value highly the work of the Research and Education Departments of the AFI we are deeply disturbed by reports of firings and resignations in those departments. If the Board does not reverse what seems to be a major shift in functioning we intend to withdraw our support of the AFI and do all that we can to make public what we regard as unconsidered and irresponsible executive action damaging to the continued progress of film study.

Signatories included college and university film department heads and instructors; film education movement leaders J. Paul Carrico and Fr Bob Duggan; students at all levels; film society directors; heads of film distribution companies; editors of film magazines; recipients of AFI Model Sites grants; and Jack C. Ellis, head of Northwestern University's film department and long-time leader in the university film education movement, also current president of the Society for Cinema Studies. Ellis sent copies of the petition, with a covering letter, to Nancy Hanks; Congressman John Brademas, Chairman of the Committe on Education that grants AFI's NEH money; Senator Claiborne Pell, similarly involved; and Dr. Harold Howe of the Ford Foundation.

The Board of Trustees agreed to meet the dismissed staff and those who had resigned, to hear their views.

DANIEL'S POSITION PAPER

Just prior to our appearance before the Board, Frantisek Daniel, former Dean of the Faculty at FAMU, the Czech film school, now Dean of Fellows and academic head of the Center, presented to the Board a new position paper for the Center. I will quote at length from this document because, as George Stevens, Jr.

later put it, it has been 'endorsed' by the Board of Trustees as a new direction for the Center, and for the roles of research, scholarship and education with the AFI; it has thus become something of an official position paper.

After summarising the AFI's main goals, 'to function as a unique national Film Conservatory with emphasis on training film artists and craftsmen, Daniel said: 'A necessary adjunct to the Center's programme of expanded tutorial relationships is a real integration of film *theory* into film *practice*—a *merging* and mutual stimulation exchange of these two areas of interest and activity.' He then envisaged the structure of a very elaborate film research institute, which he asserted is needed in the US; but concluded: 'It goes without saying that such a [Research] Center would be entirely created within or with the participation of the AFI. . . . The immediate problem is, it seems, a lack of financial resources to subsidize the evolvement of such a Center of Department in the AFI'.

There are, however:

. . . other vast fields of interest concerning AFI. These are now covered by the Education Department which should desirably be functioning to its full capacity, collecting, study, evaluating, analyzing, synthesizing, and generalizing all the different experiences and experiments in film education, elaborating and introducing the most advanced methods, forms, procedures, systems, and combinations of those, etc. etc.] Quite a job for one Education Officer and one secretary.—R.T.] In addition to the exchange of opinions and experiences thriving inside the country, thorough study of the achievements abroad, publication of textbooks, monographs, chrestomathys, methodological instruction in translation is, or should be, a part of the Educational Department activities.

At this point, Daniel distinguished between two interpretations of film education' one as

. . . education of the film consumer, film viewer, film audience—that is the development of critical judgment, aesthetical apprehension, and an understanding of the film language in the broader context of cinematic and diverse art forms, a course for the logoei of film history, etc. etc.

The other as

. . . active creativity, learning, and the mastering of the film-making process itself, with all its related necessary technical, productional, organizational, methodological and artistic skills.

Then:

From Jim Kitses' memorandum . . . it appears that just the scholarly, theoretical, speculative and passive Film Education should be favoured and promoted. As a matter of fact, this is not at all evident from any portion of Kitses' memorandum.

The other, the functional, practical, vocational, the active education seems to be considered of lesser importance or beyond the scope and orbit of the proposed [Research] Department's interest. From our point of view, this second category of film education needs even more consideration and a Center of a Department considered with advancing and generalizing experiences in this field would be as much a necessity as the Department proposed by Jim Kitses.

Daniel's point here is not clear to me: the AFI does have an entire Center devoted to the Advanced Study of film-making, which could, and some say should, be concerned with 'advancing and generalizing experiences' in the field of practical film education. That the Center has been unable to make its method and results available to any beyond the forty Fellows working there seems extravagant and, possibly, indicative of a central lack of articulation at the Center. In spite of the AFI's enormous financial outlay for the Center, Daniel went on to label such a department, on the necessary national scale, beyond 'present affordable possibilities of AFI'.

He then asserted the allegedly overlooked importance of audio-visual teaching aids, discussed it at length, and announced:

We hoped and still hope that the Center for Advanced Film Studies will produce such instructional pictures originating from the fruitful collaboration of Research and Filmmaking Fellows and serving as inspirational examples of how films can be used toward the furtherance of film education. We hope the pictures or tapes dealing with different problems of this nature will be made at the Center, which—because of its relation to the film community in Hollywood, has the best opportunity to develop teaching of this exciting calibre.

No further support was given for this statement: no explanation of how production of audio-visual materials is cheaper than the non-hardware Research activities earlier described by Daniel as beyond the AFI means.

Daniel summed up his general position as follows:

As the profile and characteristics of the best film artists are revealed, as the results of the best film schools in the world become apparent, as the time-weathered experience of other educational institutions involved in practical, professional artistic training prove the possible theoretical approaches which legitimately treat any particular art form, the 'conservatory', or 'academy' type schools need, demand, and cultivate a specific, limited and clear-cut portion of it. Film theory, as it exists today, must be considered as an extended discipline which becomes amplified, ramified, and further structured by enriching itself on the one hand independently of the development of the cinematic art and on the other, as an outgrowth of its incorporation with the theories of communication and mass culture which coincides or combines with other social, scientific disciplines.

It is not the sociology of film, psychology (or psychopathology) philosophy of time (as developed, for example, in the works of authors like Mayer, Malraux, Epstein, Barjacel, Chiarini, Barbara, or in later works of Lawson); it is not the philosophic and ideological analysis of film language, film semantics, theory of information (as practised in the works of Mets [*sic*], Plazewski, Morin, Eddo, [*sic*] etc.); nor is it the theory of communication and mass culture (McLuhan [*sic*] which originated at the professional film schools.

All of this was then applied to the film-maker. The film-maker is the rhetorical and conceptual centre of the entire paper, and by extension, then, of the entire AFI. Activities should:

. . . serve this purpose and goal: exposing the Fellows to different often controversial theories, poetics, stylistics, and aesthetics; thus, in this manner helping them to discover and define their own personal individual beliefs, persuasions, and tastes.

This, of course, is what the Research Department was making available to the Center prior to January 22.

The role of the Research Fellow in this is:

In the atmosphere of creative activity, of conflicting tastes, credos and artistic conception, in the midst of the origination of new aesthetics programs of the future American filmmakers now in existence at the Center and which has been demonstrated by the fruitful result of the past half year, a theorist or historian who loves the medium more than his theories can indeed more fully participate and realize inspiration in his field of research. With the screenings, (86) pictures in the last year; the possibility of working in the program of the Oral Histories, the participation in films on films or in the publications of the discussions which take place at the Center, the Research Fellows can find a many faceted use of their capabilities in addition to discovering an unending number of interesting stimulants for their own theoretical work. It is necessary to say that for the Fellows whose main interest is either Film Criticism or Film History, the situation is much clearer than that of a pure theorist. There could hardly be a more fruitful climate, more desirable conditions and opportunities for the critics and historians than the Center's.

Such theoretical research should root its investigations as a special institution within the Center. Theory, as it it necessary and as it should be cultivated at the Center, is seen as the generalization of the creative experience, theory as a searchlight for practice, concrete investigation, and the challenging conventions, rules, devices, etc. This, as we see it at this moment, is the function and field of exercise for theoretical research at the Center.

The existing fact that most of the film critics throughout the world cultivate their trade untouched by the reality that there are objective rules of the game, that aesthetical analysis should and must emanate from the work of art itself and not from the onlookers likes or dislikes, from his impressions, biases, prejudices, and assumptions calls for such a confrontation and co-education.

Daniel closed his review of the AFI's new position:

Constitution and development of film criticism as a serious and corroborative cultural activity is unthinkable without a deeper theoretical understanding and practical knowledge of filmmaking basics, the creative process of film-making, film history, and theory. Such an education eliminates and makes ridiculous subjectivistic impressions, infantile, academic or ideological pseudocriticism.

The Center for Advanced Film Studies seems to be the best and most vital place for such a conception of theoretical and critical film studies.

All this without a single faculty or staff member of note or competence in the areas of theory, criticism, scholarship, research, or history.

SEPARATED STAFF PRESENTATION

Unaware of the preceding, a committee of fired staff and concerned Fellows made its presentation. Jim Kitses outlined problems, priorities, and options in educational and critical terms; Fellow Bob Mundy (one of the editors of the English magazine *Cinema*) spoke for the interests of Research Fellows; Fellow Paul S. Schrader raised the question of critical standards and the national critical-cultural community; I summarized the oral history progress to date, and urged that a professional film historian be given charge of the programme; Kay Loveland presented a paper on staff-administrative problems. At the conclusion of the presentation, Stevens was asked by the Chairman if he cared to discuss the issues raised; Stevens did not; an attempt on our part to engage the Board in discussion of the issues was rebuffed; the Board preferred to keep its own private council, and thanked us. We were told that the results of their deliberations would be conveyed to us within a week.

Simultaneous reports on the Board meeting were presented by George Stevens, Jr., at Greystone, to Fellows, faculty and staff, in the presence of Gregory Peck, and Sidney Barlow; and to the fired staff and Research Fellows group, in a Beverly Hills hotel room, by George Seaton, John Culkin, and Fred Zinnemann. Also present were Kitses, Loveland, Taylor, Schrader, Mundy, Thompson, and Research Fellow Steve Mamber. We were given information which closely followed a letter, 'Notes for committee of Trustees who will meet with former employees on February 8, 1971'. A copy of this document was available to us at that time, and was later quoted from in the press. As the letter well sums up our meeting, here it is:

Those points should be made by whomever is the spokesman for the Trustees committee.

1. That the Trustees found the presentation helpful to the process of arriving at certain very important decisions concerning the AFI's future.

2. Many of your proposals coincided with recommendations which had been presented to the Board by the Director and staff.

3. Other of your proposals were helpful in clarifying our thinking and decisions.

4. It is clear that the AFI has aspirations far beyond the resources presently available. This has resulted in a staff stretched too thin and the creation of expectations around the country that cannot presently be fulfilled. Much of the meeting was devoted to exploring ways to increase the amount of funds available for AFI.

5. The Board decided to immediately launch a $250,000 fund-raising effort between now and June to offset the present deficit of the Film Institute and to stem the need to cut back further in AFI's programs in archives, education and filmmaker training.

6. The education committee of the Board chaired by David Mallery met several times throughout the weekend and will work in the next several months to come up with recommendations for consideration by the Board relative to AFI's future thrust in education. The education committee gained approval for a grant to sponsor the first national seminar for directors of regional film teachers organizations. The seminar is designed to explore the feasibility of founding an individual national membership organization which would be affiliated with the AFI and which would be provided with materials developed within the research, archival and production activities of the AFI. Joseph Dispenza was named to take charge of AFI's programs in education.

7. The Board listened to the various viewpoints on the focus of the Center with particular attention to the role of film theory within the Center. It endorsed the approach presented by Professor Daniel: 'A concentration on theory as the generalization of the creative experience, theory as a searchlight for practice, concrete investigation and challenging conventions, rules, devices, etc.' The broader education efforts described in both Daniel's and Kitses's papers must be considered in the larger scope of the AFI's ambitions and possibilities in film education. Much of this is beyond our present funding expectations.

As this concerns the research Fellows, the Board hopes they can find within the program outlined by Professor Daniel a program relevant to their continued

study. Professor Daniel will be available to discuss with each research Fellow his individual case. The Board decided that the AFI will be willing to work out a financial arrangement with Jim Kitses so that the research Fellows might have available the continuation of their consultations with him throughout the remainder of this academic year. The AFI would like to resolve within the next two weeks the status of the individual research Fellows.

8. The Board decided that the fact that Jim Kitses and Rick Thompson are in the educational profession should be taken into consideration in terms of their severance, and this will be discussed individually with each of them.

9. The Board is grateful for their concern for the AFI.

The AFI ended up paying Jim Kitses and myself through June 1. Their ruthless economy move ended up in obvious waste; had they played their cards differently, and advised us that as of June, the research programme would be terminated if funds were not found, they could have had four months' more work from us for the same cost.

At the conclusion of this meeting, pressure was put on the Board representatives to disclose their positions on the hard issues at hand. Seaton had to leave; Zinnemann, with extreme honesty and candour, apologised for being ill-informed due to his residence outside the US in recent years, and disqualified himself. Culkin stressed some of the points in the letter, and went on to indicate, in confidence, certain Board attitudes and deadlines of a rather sweeping and decisive nature, which, if true, and if realised, will certainly be seen as improvements by critics of the AFI. However, the Board's unwillingness to take immediate and specific steps, and/or to be publicly candid about AFI matters, was confirmed. At that point, the meeting concluded with the staff/research Fellow group indicating that they had followed the issues as far as they could through the administrative chain of the AFI, to Board level, and would now feel free to raise those issues not yet resolved in more public arenas.

Variety covered these events a week later, on February 16, on its own initiative. The next day, *Variety* carried AFI's side of the story. Stevens is quoted as saying:

'There are some people who feel the Film Institute should not be involved in filmmaking at all, and they are never going to be happy here, because one of the main reasons for AFI's creation was for it to be a progressive force in filmmaking.'

* * * * * * *

Of current $2,000,000 budget for the fiscal year ending in June, Stevens maintains approximately $1,000,000 is for the Center for Advanced Film Studies, other $1,000,000 for archives, education publications, and research.

Strangely, none of the money is assigned to production grants—unless they are now incorporated with film-maker training into the Center.

Stevens explained staff problems in the same article:

'There were people who wanted to change the Institute to their vision of what it should be. All organizations have them, but all organizations don't have as handy and efficient a Xerox machine.'

According to Stevens and a few Board members polled, the Board was unanimous in support of Stevens and the present programme and emphasis.

The same issue of *Daily Variety* contained this letter from Charlton Heston, who entered in the middle of our group's presentation to the Board, yet is willing to generalise about even those portions he missed:

Since I may be in a position to comment with some objectivity on the aims as well as the problems of the AFI, I'd like to point out what I think are distortions as well as some simple errors of fact in the version of recent developments at the Institute as presented to *Daily Variety* by several former employees and reported in yesterday's edition.

I'm a member of the National Council on the Arts, the federal body that originally funded the AFI. I'm not on the Institute's Board of Trustees, but I was asked to join a committee advisory to them and was present at several of the meetings of the trustees last week at which these matters were discussed.

The five separated employees [missing the introduction as he did, Heston was unaware that two of the five were Center Fellows, not employees] you mention in your story were given an opportunity at one of these meetings to present their views. Their statements were extensive, characterized largely by extremely negative evaluations of the AFI's leadership and gloomy predictions of its future if their recommendations were not followed. I'd describe both evaluations and recommendations as apocryphal in character and largely lacking in pragmatic validity. The board, insofar as I could judge, found their suggestions totally unacceptable.

. . . The industry as a whole is becoming involved in the future of the AFI, in a most specific manner.

In the AFI's vague style, that last 'specific manner' is not specified; it is of particular interest as MPAA at about this time withdrew its support of the AFI.

In *Daily Variety* (February 2, 1971) Kay Loveland responded to the above:

1. None of us has ever said or implied that we 'feel the Film Institute should not be involved in filmmaking at all.' We have said all along that we do not believe film production should consume more than half of AFI's total budget, as it has.

2. We do not want 'to change the Institute to our vision of what it should be.' We have advocated and continue to advocate the *original* vision of AFI as set forth in AFI's first brochure and all subsequent publications.

3. Your statement that 'all organizations don't have as handy and efficient a Xerox machine' implies that we used the AFI machine to duplicate the material we have circulated. As a matter of fact, the machine we used is located at the Postal Instant Press at the corner of Wilshire and Almont, where we paid 5 cents per copy per page. In all we have spent around $100 on duplicating costs.

4. Mr. Heston states that our recommendations were 'largely lacking in pragmatic validity' and that the Board, as nearly as he could judge, 'found our suggestions totally unacceptable.' His view does not seem to agree with the "Notes for the committee of Trustees who will meet with former employees" which seemed to be the guideline for the meeting we had with John Culkin, George Seaton and Fred Zinnemann on Feb. 8. [Here she cites points 1, 2, 3, and 9 of that letter.] It seems strange, if our recommendations had 'no pragmatic validity', that George Seaton would have told us that probably ten of the twelve recommendations made in my Feb. 1 statement (which 'coincided with recommendations which had been presented . . . by the director and staff') would be acted on. It also seems strange that John Culkin would have made a similar statement, that Culkin, Benton, Mallery and Zinnemann would have told us individually that our presentation helped to make this Board meeting the best, most thought-provoking that has ever been held, that Arnold Picker would have told me on February 4 that most of the recommendations I had made were things he had been trying to get for years. Surely *they* don't all lack in 'pragmatic validity'.

Research Fellow Paul Schrader became the first Fellow to resign from the Center.

Variety of April 7, 1971, carried the following:

A dispute is raging in the film education community about the two-year $800,000 grant recently awarded the AFI by the Ford Foundation. According to AFI director George Stevens, Jr., and his staff, the Ford funds are earmarked for the Coast-based training center, and can't be used for education and research, no matter how much it might be desirable to do so. Therefore, it is claimed, the Institute's emphasis on production at the expense of its other mandated activities is strictly a consequence of the conditions attached to presently available funds.

This is contradicted by McNeil Lowry of Ford, who says that the grant was based on a budget for the training center which included the education, research and critical studies faculty members who were fired. Lowry says that he has asked Stevens to clarify the matter publicly, which he has not yet done. He declines to say whether the grant would be rescinded if all budgeted activities are not restored to the Center.

In the same issue, AFI revealed its new approach to education:

The executive board of the AFI, meeting in New York today, will consider a proposal to form and finance a national organization of film teachers—a group which would substitute for the AFI itself in the field of grass-roots education.

Under the plan, formulated by a committee of board members, the Institute would give $40,000 a year for two years to a new group—largely a federation of sixteen extant regional groups, with some 5,000 film teachers as members. AFI itself would discontinue its efforts on the local level, and would restrict itself to surveys and other research in the field, which it would make available to its new affiliate.

Some critics, however, are likely to keep a close watch on the Institute budget to make sure that the new plan doesn't make educational work a stepchild to other AFI activities, notably production and filmmaker training.

Given AFI's budget secrecy, such scrutiny is impossible.

However, *Variety* of April 14, 1971, carried this item, quoted in its entirety:

The executive board of the AFI, at its meeting in New York last Wednesday, tabled a proposal to form and finance a national organization of film teachers. Board reportedly spent the bulk of its time talking about the Institute's current fund-raising problem. Apparently no mention was made of the request by the Ford Foundation to restore education and research faculties at the Center of Advanced Film Studies on the Coast. The $400,000 due from Ford for the first year of its current grant will not be forthcoming until the money is matched by outside contributions. An expected larger grant from the National Council on the Arts would not be issued until after the Council's meeting at the end of next month. [The grant has not yet been given.]

At the foot of a story announcing newly commissioned oral histories, *Variety* of May 5 noted:

Such reports had reached the ears of the Ford Foundation, which had awarded an $880,000 two year grant to the Center on the basis of a budget which included research activities. It is now presumed that Stevens has now clarified the situation to the Foundation's satisfaction.

But, in AFI style, not publicly.

IMPROVED STAFF RELATIONS

As far as improvement in staff relations goes, the AFI did finally actually enroll in the California State Unemployment Insurance programme, as it had falsely claimed to have done twice before. However, on Friday, May 21, Judy Morris, receptionist at the Center since its opening, was fired by David Lunney without warning, on charges of lateness. She had just returned the week before from a European vacation; during the week in question, she was not late. Several other AFI staff members, at all levels, were late during that week. Miss Morris had received no specific warning that her job was in jeopardy. She had been vocal in the staff meetings over Marie Fitch's firing. Robert Mundy and Cary Ghielerman, Fellows' representatives to the faculty meetings, were the only members of the Center community to raise an outcry. They sent a letter to George Stevens, covering the facts of the case, including Judy's extremely helpful relationship with Fellows—typing scripts for free, and so on—and asked for clarification.

OUTCRY

Prescott J. Wright, veteran independent film distributor, concisely hit several issues on the head in his letter of protest to the Board of Trustees, of January 1, 1971:

. . . it represents what we have suspected and feared; that Education and Research warrant the lowest priorities in the current directions of the Institute.

None of us has escaped the economic pressures of these days and if this is the rationale for reducing the Education Department to three [actually two] people and cutting off the Research Department, then one wonders how the situation was allowed to deteriorate. Surely the nature of the financial support of the Institute calls for better management and foresight on the part of the directing bodies.

If it is the intention of the AFI to vacate the field of film education and to focus on production training then it should do so honestly and openly. Other bodies can then pick up this work and the concomitant funding.

Wright had served the AFI as a distribution consultant.

Austin Lamont, publisher of *Film Comment*, received a budget summary of AFI—but hardly a complete one, as it did not include the figures for the Director's salary, which is believed to be around $70,000 per year. Lamont notes that administration and staff salaries, at $1,367,038, are greater than the sum dispersed in grants and projects, at $1,316,927.

Here are a few other figures: consultants and their travel, $134,534; rent, $138,000; and a "benefit" for the AFI—which lost $31,953.

These figures cover the first three years of AFI operation. The editorial concludes:

Here are a few specific ideas, framed after I talked with dozens of film people around the country, including AFI administration, staff, and former staff members:

1) Film Education, one of the principal needs of this country, is getting short shrift at the AFI. Film educators—critics, scholars and teachers—are not

adequately represented on the AFI Board of Trustees. The educators should elect their own full voting representatives to the AFI Board.

2) The Trustees should evaluate the Institute's policies and priorities, particularly with respect to its accomplishments as 'a catalyst and point of focus and coordination,' and they should establish and make public a new set of priorities with clearly defined goals and realistic budgets, and with waste, overhead, administrative costs, salaries and frills cut to the core.

3) The Trustees should evaluate the past performance and present attitude of the Institute's administration—its management techniques, its relationship to the film community, and its commitment to the goals of the AFI. Present administration should be replaced and the internal structure of the AFI changed, if necessary, to insure the free flow of recommendations between the AFI administration, the AFI staff and the film community.

Late in May, the Society for Cinema Studies (an organization made up of college and university teachers, film scholars, critics and archivists) distributed:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

The Society for Cinema Studies strongly supports the continuation and strengthening the American Film Institute. Its work of preserving, cataloguing, and exhibiting our film heritage is of utmost value. At the same time we deeply regret a reaction to financial stress that has caused elimination of the research and continuing dismantling of the education departments. Our primary concern being the building of an enlightened and discriminating audience, the activities of research and education are to us at least equally important as any other functions of an American Film Institute. We urge that they be restored to a parity in terms of budget and staff.

Conceiving ourselves as constituents of what should be thought of as a national public undertaking (as individuals we are being solicited to become members of the AFI), we ask that the Board of Trustees be responsible to the total film community, including the scholarly, critical and educational segments. We ask that the management of the American Film Institute be held accountable to the Board for all executive actions which do in fact relate to the policies and priorities of the Institute's program.

Specifically we ask that the Board of Trustees:

1) Review the policies and priorities of the American Film Institute and make a clear public re-statement regarding them which all can understand and refer to and to which management can be held accountable.

2) Consider the capabilities of the present management to implement these goals; remove, realign and add executive personnel if necessary to insure that the full work of an American Film Institute progresses according to stated objectives and appropriate calendar.

3) Publish annually a financial accounting of the American Film Institute's income and expenditures so that all concerned can judge how the total resources are being allocated.

4) Make certain that the scholarly, critical and educational film community is adequately represented on the Board of Trustees, and provide some mechanism by which the members of that community can help choose who will represent them.

These requests are made respectfully and for what we sincerely believe to be the best interests not only of the American Film Institute but of the whole cultural and educational life of this nation.

May 1971

Early in June, the AFI circulated a pre-release draft of George Stevens, Jr.'s response to the Austin Lamont editorial: 'A Response from the American Film Institute':

The American Film Institute is an educational institution. Everything the AFI does serves education in a number of ways. The Archive program has galvanized a national effort to preserve films so that they might survive for scholars to study and for new generations to view. Filmmakers are being educated and supported at the same time that work is being done to expand the use of films in education and, today, far from being 'eliminated,' thirty-six AFI-supported researchers and scholars are gathering history and data. We believe that film education relates not only to the growing community of film educators, but also to the artists and the audiences who sustain the art. In this light, everything the Institute engages in can be seen as educational.

The American Film Institute, nevertheless, is probably not as good as those of us who work for it think it is, nor as bad as its antagonists would like to portray it. It is perhaps closer to the picture seen by objective observers and critics—that of any unusually productive four-year-old with some triumphs and some mistakes. Yet most criticism of this four-year-old questions not the *quality* of accomplishment but the *quantity* of work in one area or another. Constructive debate can center around these questions of emphasis, the more so if polemics and misstatements are put aside. Look closely at AFI's trustees and you will find a serious group of people who brought it into existence, made human judgments in matters of program, priorities and personnel, and raised three-quarters of its total funding from private sources. Having made that effort, they have been vigilant to prevent careless spending. Perhaps this Board would be strengthened by more educators and critics, but Arthur Knight, John Culkin and David Mallery have spoken forcefully for education since AFI's founding, the latter two as members of the Executive Committee. Yet no Board members have spoken for a single interest. New trustees or visitors to Board meetings are invariably surprised to see the depth of interest and commitment executives and actors hold for film preservation and film study in the schools. And, less surprisingly, the educators have found value in the study center in California. This mixture of interests is basic to AFI's unique thrust and is its strength—disparate elements of the film community joined by a shared concern for the art of film. The executives and prominent artists are there partly because they can help make it all happen, but to limit them to the size of their influence is a mistake, so too to confine Ed Emshwiller, Ricky Leacock, Francis Coppola and Arthur Penn to a narrow interest in filmmaking.

Film Comment offered 750 words and twenty-four hours to broad and scattered charges. A complete report on AFI's first four years will be issued in July. *Film Comment* readers may write AFI for a copy. It will contain a complete listing of all activities, all individuals and projects assisted by the Institute, audited financial data, and evaluations of the problems and challenges ahead. Meanwhile, be assured that research is not eliminated, it is stronger than ever; that the 'staff salaries' to 'projects and grants' ratio represents no incredible disparity—AFI is not a foundation, but an operating team consisting of cataloguers, librarians, projectionists, archivists, faculty, theatre personnel, educators, accountants, as well as the secretaries who do all the work. (The British Film Institute expends the equivalent of 80 percent of its government support for staff.) The report will detail 5,000 American films safeguarded; five summer seminars for film teachers; grants for eighty-six independent filmmakers; annual published surveys of university film courses; a definitive 1635-page Catalog of films of the twenties (the first of nineteen volumes); the funding of twenty-two oral history projects; a film repertory theatre; twenty-seven internships for filmmakers; support for *Filmfacts* magazine (still struggling); the founding of the Community Film Workshop Council; a weekly educational television program; scholarships, fellowships; model film education sites; subsidies for film co-op catalogs; and an advanced conservatory where filmmakers learn artist... craft and discipline, and where theory and history are being compiled and refined.

This is only a part of what we would have liked to do in those four years. But it has been achieved through the creation of a structure which has encouraged concerted action from previously fragmented sectors of the film community. This is a big country, and we are still a small organization. If you want to help and be involved, write to me and we will look for a way.

While it may be true that the BFI expends the equivalent of 80 per cent of its government support for staff, this is not at all clear to me from the *BFI Annual Report and Accounts 1970*. Budget reports, of course, are not necessarily organized for clarity. One AFI budget report which Kahlenberg has appraised as reasonably accurate, and representative of the same ratios of allocation for fourth-year spending, listed:

Archives	$1,000,000
Education	400,000
Research and publications	450,000
AFI Theatre	240,000
Production grants	1,350,000
Center	2,100,000
Administration	1,000,000
Total	6,540,000

When I asked Kahlenberg why 'Research and Publications' was so large for a staff of three for eighteen months, with no budget (beyond the $150,000 Mayer grant, which is probably figured into the total, thus accounting with staff for $200,000 tops), he indicated that the figure included AFI's promotional brochures as well. Not that they were mentioned in AFI's structural plans when 'Publications' were itemised. That yields a figure of $250,000 for, presumably, promotional material, plus a subsidy to *Filmfacts* and an unspecified grant to *Filmmaker's Newsletter*. It is also possible that, in Hollywood studio fashion, a portion of Center overhead may be invisibly bolstering some budgets. During the first year of Center operation, when the Research Department consisted of a staff of three, one and a half Research Fellows, and two rooms in the mansion, the Center officer then preparing budgets told me that Research Department was carrying 23 per cent of the Center overhead. I do not know how long this condition persisted. At any rate, it would be most helpful if AFI's published budget data were detailed, explicit, and complete, without room for ambiguity.

IV. In Conclusion

Variety, June 2, 1971, carried a story on the Society for Cinema Studies letter, with the comment:

"Though Institute director George Stevens thus far has failed to issue a public clarification of budgetary priorities, he has consistently denied that the AFI's education and research departments are being down graded. Rather, he's blamed a recent wave of firings and the resignations in those areas on differences of opinion on how the jobs should be done.

"Stevens points to a recent series of research grants and to a reassessment of the AFI's film education role by a special committee of the board as evidence of an accounting commitment."

As of March 27, 1971, this 'reassessment . . . by a special committee of the board, the Education Committee of Mallery, Culkin, Knight, and Benton, had not yet been finished or distributed, though it was begun in early February. Also, note the emergence of yet another reason for the firings: though first simply attributed to required budgetary trims, they are now the result of differences of opinion on how the jobs should be done. Shifty, but fair enough; however, the fact that those jobs have not yet been refilled casts doubt on this explanation.

Stevens is correct enough in citing the on-going work of the Mayer oral history project. However, his attempts to use this single programme to masquerade as the entire Research effort is strained. *Variety* (May 5, 1971) carries such an attempt:

"Reports that research activities are reduced or eliminated at the Center are completely untrue, Stevens asserted."

In fact, whether Stevens is willing to recognize it or not, the firings of all Research staff in January abruptly terminated the following Research activities, which have not been resumed or replaced:

1. Jim Kitses's final draft writing of his AFI book on last year's summer seminar, which had just reached final rough draft when he was fired.

2. A collection of close studies in visual analysis methods, which had been initiated by staff and Fellows of the Department.

3. A collaborative study of the Warners school of animation, for which screenings and writing had begun (indeed, the firings occurred during the third of the weekly screenings, and terminated the series prematurely).

4. The establishment of a project to pool, circulate and encourage the execution of translations of film material in foreign languages for which English translations are currently unavailable on a large scale.

5. Meaningful tutorial relationships between Research Fellows and critical faculty. Research Fellows are unanimous in asserting that AFI's total current utility for them since the firings is in the screening of films, certainly an advantage, but a far cry from the vigorous dialogue that had taken root prior to January 22.

6. Support of Research Auditors, who were to begin their stay at AFI the Monday following the firings, who have received only token support in the form of screenings—certainly not the participation in an active community they had been led to believe was available.

7. Distribution by the Department of bibliographies and supportive duplicated material relative to the weekly screening programme topics—which topics, it seems, have also been discontinued since the demise of the Research Department, who arranged them.

8. Weekly critical seminars of substance, prepared for by screenings, readings, and presentations worked up by individual Fellows and staff, conducted on a rigorous level of close discussion.

9. General input to the Center culture of solid critical and scholarly content. Certainly no one currently at the Center is significantly involved in creating, or even following, film criticism and culture, beyond film-making activities and the screening of some current new films. The Center library, as a result of the Research staff firings, has shelved plans for acquiring major foreign language journals, such as backruns of *Cahiers du Cinema*, obviously because there is no one to use them.

10. The 'research into the language of cinema' originally envisioned in the Center outline as a research activity, has stopped short.

11. Several individual monographs and book-length projects were suddenly deprived of all but screening support.

In a larger context, since the AFI's inception, it seems that the only programmes cancelled or discontinued have been in the areas of education, publications, and research (this is not widely known because the AFI, while publicising extensively the initiation of programmes, never publicly announces terminations). Production, AFI Theatre, Film-maker Training, and Archives have remained intact, if perhaps reduced in funding, while the following programmes in Education and Publications have been dropped:

1. Film Information Office
2. Model Sites funding
3. Regional Screenings programme
4. *American Film* magazine
5. Films on film
6. Grants to graduate scholars
7. Distribution of curriculum documents in Xerox form
8. Separate Education Department Newsletter (now incorporated in the monthly *AFI Report* promotional pamphlet, much reduced in length)
9. Research Department (see above)

It seems quite clear from this that Film-maker Training, Production, the Theatre, and Archives have received solid support, and that Education, Publications, and Research have been considered in *abstracto practice* more expendable and of lower priority.

The AFI has done very well in the areas of archives and preservation, film-maker grants, and probably, on a purely technical level, film-maker training. These are concrete, quantifiable areas of activity, easily fitted into AFI management's product and production orientated thinking. Behind this stupid administrator's positivism are two key conceptual sets. The first is AFI's frequent rhetorical polarisation of film-making on one end of the scale, and criticism and scholarship on the other. The alternative formulation, which one would have thought more useful for AFI, sees film-making, teaching, criticism—all flowing from a common centre, the film itself—as object and idea. However, the AFI prefers to separate these elements as much as possible, and to underemphasise or ignore the role of ideas and disciplines.

The second conceptual problem is also dichotomous. The AFI operates the technical and concrete group of its programmes actively, as works; while it operates the intellectual and educational group of programmes passively, as organization and administration. The AFI's major failure to date does not lie in what it has done, but in what it hasn't done—indeed, hasn't even conceived of. *The AFI's education effort has been responsive, rather than initiative; consequently, it has been limited by the boundaries and deficiencies of the field to which it responds. Its service activities have been of value, but they have also dragged down activities in other areas—creative rather than data-orientated material, dialogue, criticism, ideas, educational and critical works of substance. This reflects a trend in the US film education movement at large—mainly a secondary school movement—which, responding to reductive interpretations of Mcluhan, plunged into organising teacher networks and circulating information. These activities very quickly outstripped whatever conceptual base the movement had and left it without a core.* This imbalance is laboriously being corrected without much AFI help.

With the single exception of Archives, the results of which are available only to a very, very few, the AFI has focused the great majority of its financial and staff resources on seventy-five film-maker grant recipients, thirty intern trainees, and perhaps sixty Fellows and Auditors of the Center for Advanced Film Study, while serving the much larger constituencies of film scholars, teachers, students, and the interested public with promotional material, lists of college film courses, teachers' addresses, and little else.

Under the Archives programme, the AFI has put up a good filmography project—the National Film Catalog—but has failed to fill equally pressing needs in the areas of bibliography, translation, the clearing house for project listings called for by Toeplitz, or ground work in television history and aesthetics. It's even more irritating when one realises how much further funds go in education and the interested public with promotional material, lists of college film production.

In response to my request for an interview, and a subsequent letter listing specific information I desired, Richard Kahlenberg, Assistant Director of the AFI for Planning, met with me. Much of the data I sought was budgetary—breakdowns of costs for various programmes, salaries, Center cost and overhead. While not refusing to answer these questions, Kahlenberg did not bring such information, and indicated that he did not know these budgetary specifics.

Kahlenberg advanced the new *Discussions* series as a useful publication, and a broadly distributed product of the Center. The first Discussion *pamphlet* is priced at $1.00 and contains thirteen small pages of chopped-up press conference transcript, most of it available in numerous other Fellini interviews; Fellini's appearance at the Center, which provided the transcript, was simple promotion (see Rick Setlowe's story, *Variety* [January 21, 1970], lead paragraph). The second *Discussion* is with Rouben Mamoulian, and is nearly a mirror image of Robinson's 1963 *Sight and Sound* interview. When I challenged that such duplicatory and lazily-conceived efforts were wasteful, Kahlenberg replied that if even one new fact gained circulation through the *Discussions* series, it was worth it. This attitude is one of the AFI's most dangerous, because it is used to excuse lack of decent preparation and execution, resulting in wasted time, effort, materials, and opportunities. Reasonable preparation could assure that many new facts would certainly gain circulation—but this preparation is not undertaken, partially because the AFI has no personnel resources in this area. This is one of many examples of the AFI's inability to comprehend the cross-over points of raw, factual data with critical method and experience. Another misconception is that the collection of oral history interviews, some good, some mediocre, constitutes a research and critical studies programme; this parallels the reductive notions that history is simply names and dates, and that education is the transmission of information.

Such large and small conceptual failures linked with management and Trustees very one-sidedly weighted toward production thinking: as well as interlocking Board members shared by AFI, its parent agency, and subsequent funding agencies—which might be thought to supervise it—have left the AFI in a questionable condition.

7.6 million dollars have been spent, but not accounted for, of public, foundation, and private funds. For this investment we have received a good archive; a useful National Film Catalog; a Center for Advanced Film Study, which has given us ten short films or so, will give us a feature film, but has been unable as an experimental educational project to give us an account of itself, to turn its activities and enormous cost—probably over $2 million—into any material or method of value to others in the field; promotional publications; a token education effort, pitched at the lowest viable level of activity and ambition; and a National Film Theatre which shows film in Washington, D.C., at the deficit cost of at least $100,000 per year (this theatre is often described by the AFI as a Cinematheque, but its programming is on the popular side of NFT, and its influence on American film writing and thought almost nil).

The AFI has often counter-punched critics by accusing them of trying to destroy the AFI, certainly a grim prospect; if the AFI goes down, so do the chances for a film institute here for some time to come. However, any viable public service orientated institution should be able to stand open scrutiny and discussion. The possibility that the AFI can be killed from within should not be discounted either.

I have quoted remedial proposals from other groups earlier. Certainly, the AFI's absolutely closed decision-making process must be opened up; and a national dialogue must be conducted, by all concerned with the AFI, to redirect its efforts. While Kahlenberg agreed with my evaluation of American film culture as being in desperate need of aid, he indicated that the AFI had no particular idea of how to go about aiding it, beyond current AFI programmes. That makes it absolutely clear that the AFI needs administrators who do have some idea of how to go about it.

Anti-intellectualism must be rooted out of the AFI and replaced by a creative and constructive comprehension of the broadest uses of education, criticism, and scholarship.

[From Film Quarterly, Summer 1971]

The Unloved One

(By Ernest Callenbach)

CRISIS AT THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

In our Summer 1961 issue, Film Quarterly printed a detailed plan for an American Film Institute, prepared by Colin Young on the basis of extended discussions with educators, film-makers, critics, distributors, exhibitors, museum and archive personnel, film society people, and others. In 1966 the AFI actually came into existence, thanks to support from Lyndon Johnson, and in the following years it carried out various programs. Since the firing of research staff from AFI's Los Angeles Center for Advanced Film Studies, early in 1971, there has been much public and private debate over AFI's functioning, and its fate now hangs in the balance, with decisions on future funding about to be made as we go to press. The following article is based on extensive conversations with dozens of AFI critics and supporters, including many people who have been in positions to observe AFI operations, and also with the director of AFI, George Stevens, Jr., who discussed AFI policies with me and provided other useful information. The article attempts to put forward an assessment of AFI performance so far, and to make a series of policy recommendations (some of them for drastic changes, some for continuation of previous policies) as a basis for working toward a consensus on the AFI which would help to ensure not only its survival but its continuation with widespread support in the film community.

Outside assessments generally seem somewhat beside the point to inhabitants of a given institution, as is clear to anyone in a university rated on some national scale; and the American Film Institute, though not very large as institutions go in present society, is a complex entity which no one person can ever quite grasp. Yet there seems no escape from the attempt—even though we must also recognize, candidly, that thinking about institutions is almost always a bore. In our over-institutionalized era, the great drift of thought and feeling is paradoxically anti-institutional: as our corporations and universities and military establishment grow ever larger and more bureaucratic, the human beings who actually inhabit them grow ever more disaffected—the controllers as well as the controllees. These major institutions already show signs of fatal strain; at some point not many years off, they seem likely to suffer catastrophic breakdowns, of which we already see the signs: industrial sabotage and general laxity are widespread, students have lost virtually all confidence in the rationality of university purposes and structures, and the military apparatus is on the verge of "unreliability," with desertion, fragging, drug-taking, and political or conscientious objection reaching stupendous levels. Large institutions have one main advantage: clout. Sometimes this translates into some kinds of efficiency, and sometimes not. But they always have one fatal disadvantage: they are no fun. Living within them, as Frederick Wiseman has patiently been showing us in his films, is a damned drag; and the natural reaction of people everywhere is to withdraw not only political allegiance but also intelligence, energy, and love, which they attempt to deploy in more direct, human, and life-enhancing channels. Thus, the slogans of organizationally sophisticated people, these days run along such lines as: *Never create one big organization where three small ones would do! Decentralize! Let those who do the work have a role in controlling it!*

It is obligatory to think in such large and personal terms at the start, if we wish to generate any real perspective in which to view the AFI and its achievements and failure; otherwise we remain captives of mere isolated current events. If the AFI is worth thinking about at all, we must think about it seriously, not only for what it might practically accomplish that would seem good to us, but as an institution which seeks to maintain itself, grow, and seek support or sympathy from human beings. This is not subjecting AFI to some kind of idiosyncratic political test; it is simply to acknowledge that, like all institutions in this era, AFI must be evaluated not only in terms of works (the old Puritan standard) but also in terms of what it adds to the human environment—whether it is an entity that commands human sympathy. Institutions which cannot command it

will ultimately wither; for even our majestic main institutions, despite all the money and violence at their disposal, are finally vulnerable to the simple withdrawal of people's acquiescence.

On the other hand, if we wish to think seriously about the institutions of the film world, it is also important not to be sentimental—that is, not to concentrate merely on "the good of the art" and similar wholesome generalities. A scheme for a national film institute was put forward by people with the good of the art in mind, but it lay around for a long time without anything happening. The actual American Film Institute with money in the bank arose only because the national government and big foundations (which are less distinguishable than you might imagine) decided it was a good thing, and the big film companies went along.

Now in general a capitalist state takes an economic role in an art under only two conditions, which may not be exclusive, either the art is foundering commercially (like opera and dance) and is maintained by the state because it is ornamental and preserves an upper-class cultural image; or the art is potentially useful or dangerous in political terms, as film was to Goebbels and Mussolini (to whom we owe the Centro Sperimentale and Venice Film Festival). The stigmata of such state intervention are by now well known and easily recognized; in this country their most spectacular manifestation is what is called the Lincoln Center Syndrome. The chief symptoms are: massive, ornate, expensive buildings, centralized programs administered from above with little or no public participation; great losses incurred from misestimation of public reactions; a chronic disproportion in budgeting whereby ceremonial and decorative functions consume greater funds than actual work; and a fear of programs that might liberate energies from below and bring about organization from the bottom up, either by "producers" of the art or "consumers."

Such are the natural dangers to which any art institution founded under the conditions we live in may be theoretically expected to fall prey.

Certainly the film industry was in trouble; some of its more forward-looking members, at least, realized a film institute might help develop the new talent that was no longer being trained within the corporate structure; they also doubtless hoped that it could take over certain research and coordination functions that the industry might otherwise have to undertake itself, and that it could serve as a focus of national concern for the art in a more politically neutral sense than the industry's actual trade associations. Certainly also the government is aware of the dangerous potential of film in an era when the media have demonstrated profound braking effects upon the government's ability to generate war hysteria; sophisticated *Kulturpolitik* thinkers may have hoped that an institute, by "taming" dissident talents through periodic infusions of cash, might help stem the steady brain drain from the industry into alternate modes of expression; and even if this didn't always help, at least the institute would be in touch with a sizable portion of the possibly dangerous film-makers of the country. Whatever precise motives proved critical, it was clear that any American film institute would be a *liberal* force in that special American sense in which Lyndon Johnson, who authorized the AFI's beginnings, was a liberal; and George Stevens, Jr., who had run the US Information Agency foreign-propaganda film program, was a reliable liberal to run the new institution.

The record compiled by Stevens and his staff seems to me a mixed one. Checking off AFI's score against our theoretical dangers, in brief summary (I will return to some of these items below):

The AFI has indeed acquired its monumental edifice, in the Greystone mansion in Beverly Hills; its administration presently resides there, behind fences and guards. Its mode of operation has been largely centralist, though it has regularly sought advice from widespread sources. Its Theater in Washington, lacking the support of a sizable community of film goers and saddled with unrealistically large operating expenses, has lost large sums and jeopardized the future possibility of regional theaters. Lastly, by failing to develop either a distribution system or a general membership organization, and being unable to clarify its relations with grantee film-makers, AFI has cut itself off from its ultimate potential for political health, namely a working relationship of mutual support from wide elements of the American film community.

In the present crisis, characterized by vigorous criticism of AFI priorities, administrative practices, accounting and personnel relations, plus grave doubts about continued financing, it seems essential to keep these "strategic" considera-

tions in mind while reviewing the actual work which, in its almost four years, AFI has accomplished. Stevens sometimes replies to critics that the defects of AFI are due mainly to trying to do too much too fast. In the administrative sense, this may be true: AFI has fostered many unrelated projects that never quite worked out to anything. But in a larger and more crucial sense, it may be argued that AFI has done too little: it has not attacked the problems of distribution which were a main consideration of most of those who proposed a film institute in the first place; it has not attempted to build a practical relationship with a large constituency until financial disaster loomed; and it has lacked a sense that the problems of the film world are connected with the large and agonizing issues of how the arts should help us confront life in a pathologically "advanced" industrial society.

What then has AFI been doing, and what should it be doing if it hopes to win wide support for its continuance?

Archives and Catalogue

The main initial thrust of AFI attention and expenditure was toward the recovery, preservation, and cataloguing of the basic theatrical film heritage of the country. The great gap in the Library of Congress and other archives of the twenties and thirties was somewhat filled in. Decomposing nitrate prints in various collections were transferred to acetate stock, although some $10 million is needed to complete the job. "Lost" films were turned up in attics, European archives, neglected vaults.

Some 5,000 films have reportedly been saved, altogether. AFI should make it possible for outside historical researchers to evaluate and use these new resources, by publishing a working mimeographed list of the titles involved, although the consensus of opinion is that the task of salvage has been well performed. (Also—late in the game, but better than never—a knowledgeable advisory committee has been set up for the archive work.) At any rate, a substantial number of additional films can now be studied in the LC archive. They can be examined only on a Steenbeck table and cannot circulate; but they exist.

Moreover, an exhaustive catalogue of American theatrical films has been established, on the lines of national catalogues that had been produced in other countries, providing at last a central source of factual information about virtually all theatrical films from the past. The first volume of this catalogue is about to be published, and will constitute a first-rate research source. It is also important to begin charting the great morass of nontheatrical film, or at least selected parts of it, since it is in this area that most significant developments are hence forth likely to center.

Such a project, it bears noticing, is the kind of thing that a large organization with a lot of money is well equipped to carry out: initiative at the top, backed by cash and with reasonably good staff selection, can set objective goals and achieve them. The recommendation here seems clear:

The preservation and catalogue programs should be continued as before the drastic financial crisis budget cuts; and an active campaign should be undertaken toward obtaining congressional funding for the remaining nitrate-transfer work. Organizationally, the objective here should be to spin off the permanent archive work into the Library of Congress once funding of the Film Division has risen to sufficient levels to support it; the LC is our *de facto* national archive, and it would be silly to maintain a separate organization to do its work for it on any except the present emergency basis. The salary amounts necessary to the AFI work of locating and obtaining films are small in any case, less than $40,000 per year. The essential beyond that is to procure the massive funding needed to complete the archival job—involving sums far beyond any realistic AFI budgeting. Once that task is accomplished, AFI should probably continue itself to maintaining a kind of scholarly "visiting committee" which would periodically assess the work of the LC archivists and of our other "private" archives.

Independent Film Maker Support

Another largely successful AFI program was the providing of production funds to independent film makers, and for a time to film students and to scriptwriters. There has been confusion and some hot feeling about the contract provisions on distribution; the money provided was never a free grant but in effect a loan. However, on the whole this program seems to have been well administered; it came somewhat near the granting agency ideal: a small office containing one

decision-maker with a telephone to a knowledgeable board of advisors, one secretary, and one check-writing machine. Funds were given to a surprisingly wide variety of film-makers, some well known for highly unorthodox works, some not known at all. It will be some time still before a careful evaluation and assessment of this program is possible. However, scriptwriting grants were given in 1968 and 1969 to 14 projects by writers including Melvin Van Peebles, Jim McBride, Arthur Barron, Fred Wiseman, Terry Sanders, and Jack Gelber; even if these all turned out to be failures, they would be honorable ones. Film-maker grants in 1968 went to 24 projects, and have resulted in films including Paul Sharits' *Razor Blades*, Robert Kramer's *Ice*, Will Handle's *Watersmith*, Jimmy Murakami's *The Good Friend*, and John Korty's *Imogen Cunningham*. Thirty grants in 1969 aided films that have included George Manupelli's *Dr. Chicano*, Jordan Belson's *Momentum*, and John Hancock's *Sticky My Fingers, Fleet My Feet*. The 1970 grants aided Bruce Baillie's *Quick Billy*, Connie Beeson's *Ana: A Portrait*, and projects by Tom Palazzolo, Andrew Sarris, Scott Bartlett, Patricia Anslin, Caleb Deschanel, and James McBride. AFI plans include some $3,081,888 for film-maker support in fiscal year 1972, if the desired level of financing is obtained. The American film world is substantially richer by the films that AFI has helped finance, and a substantial expenditure in this area will continue to be desirable. The recommendation here, therefore, is: *Independent film-maker support should be continued much as before, but with true grants.*

Distribution

However, film-maker support is not an absolute good in itself. Funds spent on film-making help bolster supply; they do nothing to increase demand. Making films is only half the battle, and not the harder half either. In film as in other arts, *we do not lack talent; we lack new connections between talent and audiences*. The old connections provided when the theatrical industry was an efficiently functioning mass-production machine have been broken. The problem of building new connections is the overriding organizational problem of the art at present—with ramifications on aesthetic, technological, economic, political, legal, and industrial levels. The old Hollywood forms no longer work; the economic mechanisms of the industry's "independent" production are becoming unfeasibly chancy; the role of film in public life and as an industry is increasingly uncertain.

In such circumstances we surely might have expected a national film institute to address major energy to this area of concern. This could have meant, to give some examples: carrying out a somewhat detailed inquiry into the nature and sources of the problems vexing our distribution system; exploring novel distribution approaches which commercial distributors have not so far been able or willing to experiment with; attempting to coordinate the alternate circuits that have already come into existence in the college and university world, so that their joint economic weight would be more usefully felt; pressing new technology (8mm, videotape, cassettes, etc.) into the service of increasing diversity and directness of contact between film-makers, film-viewers, and film teachers; initiative in planning how to utilize educational and cable TV. AFI has moved in none of these directions, and as far as I can determine from talking with Stevens, has not even taken the matter seriously enough to debate policy alternatives. (This is *not*, apparently, because of obstructionism by industry representatives on the Board of Trustees, as has been rumored.)

In the event, thus, although AFI has given partial support to many excellent production projects, the distribution even of these films has been left in limbo. In some cases the film-makers have themselves been able to make distribution deals (sometimes only after hassling with AFI). In some cases films remain on the shelf. In a few cases AFI has made or instigated deals. But these activities have all remained passively within the existing constipated distribution machinery, when what is needed is precisely some energetic initiative in breaking through the existing blockages.

It is important to realize that new films have been left increasingly stranded during the period of AFI's existence because of the cannibalization of the old independent 16mm distributors by big corporations; in the ensuing reorganizations aimed at greater profitability, the distributors have lost their film-wise staffs, and their openness to new films has declined sharply; they are making plenty of money with the old collections—built up not by corporate managers but by individual small businessmen who loved films and had taste: Tom Brandon, Leo Dratfield, Willard Morrison, and their many unsung colleagues. It has,

ironically, been precisely during the period when American independent production has blossomed artistically that distribution has become harder, with filmmakers turning increasingly to self-help groups like Canyon Cinema and the New York Film Makers Coop.

But it is not only to prevent its own films from lying unseen that AFI initiative in distribution is essential. There are at least three other major cultural reasons. First, the obstacles to circulation of foreign films are such that the U.S. can be called a cinematically under-developed nation; there is a great backlog of interesting foreign films that have never gained distribution in this country, and the situation is steadily deteriorating, though we have not yet achieved the isolation of a poverty-stricken East European country like Poland. (Here, for instance, AFI coordination could assemble booking guarantees that would cover subtitling costs.) Second, distributor price policies are gradually forcing a contraction and distortion of film use by small colleges and in classrooms. The boom in college large-audience showings has led to a creeping and then galloping inflation of rentals. The situation has become so serious that some kind of concerted boycott by educators is now being contemplated, on a national basis; if housewives can roll back supermarket prices, the reasoning goes, so can film teachers, who are potentially a far more tightly organizable group. (Here, active AFI pressure on distributors could have helped develop realistic sliding scales to ensure the availability of the basic materials of the art for those who wish to teach it.) Third, only by reaching out to a national general membership with meaningful services can AFI build the constituency it needs; and better distribution is not only a need, it is *the* need which all American film lovers share. If AFI can provide greater availability of films, it can presumably also provide admission reductions, price advantages on books and publications, membership information services, and other worthwhile services.

This is perhaps the place to repeat that some cultural organizations—including our operas, film festivals, subsidized theater companies, and similar elements of "managed culture"—are run by initiative and money coming down from on high. When the money stops, they stop, because their vitality has been artificially induced. The old film-society movement, now largely replaced by programs managed by paid college officials, was an example of a different way of doing things: self-propelled, self-financed, and self-controlled. In the Film Makers Coop, Canyon Cinema, Newsreel, American Documentary Films, and similar groups we have contemporary examples: operations where the initiative comes from the people who badly want to accomplish something, and somehow find the wherewithal and energy needed to do it. These organizations are always a bit slapdash and seemingly in constant jeopardy; they have beat-up furniture, funky offices, unpaid phone bills, and unorthodox habits of correspondence. But they have a lot of good friends; they are resilient; they are respected and loved because of what they do and who they are, not because of their "image." We need more of them; and wherever possible we should do what has to be done through organizations of that type rather than through cushy-financing outfits. It is not only that, dollar for dollar and man for man, such small, personal organizations are more efficient than big, heavy-administrative-cost ones, but that they are more pleasant and liberating places to work in.

The Center for Advanced Film Studies

I must move on, however, to the stage of AFI's history when Stevens moved from Washington to Los Angeles and began the Center there, which led some observers to fear a concentration on production and a neglect of AFI's other functions. At first such fears appeared groundless, for the chief activity in LA was to be the school at Greystone, intended as a "conservatory" for talented young film-makers, operating on a tutorial system and combining production training, scholarly research, and actual film-making. The Greystone mansion (a city-owned white elephant in Beverly Hills acquired for $1 per year but expensive to repair, maintain, and guard) was refitted with offices, a very costly projection booth and screening room, and sophisticated modern editing and sound equipment. It became, in effect, a small studio. Serfs from the outside enter the grounds through a guarded gate, reminiscent of the old studio fiefdoms. The main building is enormous in scale, and its wide corridors, balconies, and staircases seem strangely empty, as if the place has carried over some of the atmosphere of a mortuary from its use as one in Richardson's film *The Loved One*. (Foreshadowingly, this was Greystone's last practical use before AFI took it over, except for hippies crashing overnight in the extensive grounds.)

Something like $2 million, which is about one third of AFI's total outlays, has been spent so far on the Center, and its projected 1972 budget is over a million; these outlays have been toward the education of some 40 Fellows. This scale of expenditure has given rise to the charge that the Center tail is now wagging the Institute dog. As Kay Loveland, Steven's former assistant who resigned in protest against AFI policies and firings puts it, "It appears that $2.6 million has been spent at the Center so that 30 film makers can have inadequate production experience. They have been less than prolific so far. While they have received script counseling from Frank Daniel and have written a number of short and feature scripts, they have certainly failed to gain much practical experience in film-making—and they hardly needed a mansion and $2.6 million to write scripts."

The Center is, it seems to me, a microcosm of AFI problems in "miniature," and its orientation thus needs extensive discussion. The basic aim, according to Stevens, was to help train a new generation of American film-makers who might do for America what the New Wave did in France. Although most early thinking about an AFI did *not* envision a new school as a necessary part of an institute, the pulling and hauling over the Stanford Research Institute's "independent" study (which paralleled AFI's start) resulted in the inclusion of a school in the AFI's tentative organization chart.

Now on a basic level, it is extremely difficult to justify spending any money at all to establish another film school in the United States, as opposed to available easy alternatives such as subsidizing existing schools, making grants to deserving young film-makers, or establishing an extensive apprenticeship system. The sole argument for doing so would be if one had a scheme in mind which could in fact hope to accomplish what happened in Paris. For on a more mundane level, it is relatively easy and getting easier to teach film-makers the technical rudiments of the art. As Conrad Hall (no mean technician) recently remarked, "The technique is all easy to learn. I could teach anyone to be a cameraman in a week." Film courses in high schools, colleges, and university extension classes are widely available; besides, many aspirants are capable of teaching themselves much of what they need to know technically, with a little help from their friends in film companies, television crews, film school classes, and so on.

On the other hand, no one has yet proved that film as an art can be taught anywhere, or in any amount of time, or with any amount of machinery. The artistic record of our film schools is not impressive when compared, for instance, with that other great "school," vaudeville; and it might well be argued that the most successful contemporary film school is not a school at all, but the Cinematheque Francaise. The lesson of Paris is indeed an instructive one: for the impact of the official school, the IDHEC, was as nothing; what counted was the impact of Langlois's incessant and dumb foundlingly catholic film exhibitions on the one hand, and the impact of the thinking done by Andre Bazin and his colleagues on the other. What happened in Paris during the formative years of the New Wave was that a considerable number of film-mad young people took advantage of Langlois's policies and, by forming a dense network of cineclubs of their own, added still further to the screening resources of their city; they talked film incessantly; and they then used these experiences to work out their own new ways of making films. We are still taking the precise measure of their achievements, which can (despite their diversity) be looked at as a pushing of the American individualist cinema to its ultimate, logical conclusions; but the important thing to remember is that these achievements flowed from an *intellectual* tradition, operating at a particular juncture of history and film history. If we are to trace a somewhat similar course, therefore, it is not the example of the IDHEC we must follow, but that of Langlois and Bazin. In short, difficult problems of theory and orientation must be dealt with; and the only way they can be dealt with is to mobilize the kinds of resources marshalled in Paris: endless screenings open to all who care about the art; endless discussions, private and public; endless theorizing and criticizing in a variety of publications; and finally, an openness to new talents on the part of financial backers and distributors.

It seems to me highly doubtful that such an intellectual enterprise can be carried out in Los Angeles, but I am not against an attempt being made; indeed the attempt should also be made in New York, San Francisco, Boston, Chicago. However, Greystone is totally unsuited as a Los Angeles site for it, and the elitist assumptions that underlie the Center are totally inappropriate. There is no human way of ascertaining who are the Truffauts, Godards, Chabrols,

Rohmers of America, and then bringing them to the Center to ripen; they can be found—indeed they can only find themselves—solely through a complex social process of dealing with films, each other, and the American situation. Therefore, if the AFI is to have any significant effect in this direction, it will not be through the operation of the closed-off Center, which is after all just another (if richer) film school added to those already existing in L.A., but through its aid in developing general American film culture; in other words, through its primary tasks in the archive, education, research, and distribution areas.

There are two main obstacles facing all talented young people wishing to develop their film-making talents and undertake commercial film-making at present: the difficulty of getting one's first films distributed, and the difficulty of getting "into" the industry, union-wise, influence-wise, etc. The Center has some effect in these areas for its chosen few. But both of these are general problems that the AFI *could* attack if it wished: by developing an aggressive distribution policy and by a large apprenticeship program, similar to its intern opportunities but (1) far more numerous, and (2) extended to nontheatrical films, which by now may well interest more talented young film-makers than theatrical features do. The nurturing of talent is a statistical game, as the old studios knew: you must plant a lot of acorns to get a few oaks. To get some perspective on the way in which film-school spending can be evaluated, we should remember that with the funds that have been spent on the Center, about 600 apprenticeship grants could have been made, assuming something like $3,000 per grant, which most grantees could supplement with income from the productions they work on. (Those fellows who have had internships have generally reported themselves immensely benefitted, incidentally; this seems to be the most successful aspect of Center educational effort.)

To the principled case against any AFI school at all, we must add many other difficulties. The faculty, with the exception of Frank Daniel who was formerly dean of the Prague Film school, has had no educational background; the operations of the school have had no theoretical or intellectual orientation that might justify its elitist position. Daniel is a good screenwriter and a fatherly figure who is apparently excellent as a script supervisor; but he comes from an utterly alien tradition and has had no significant intellectual contribution to make to film thought; his draft outline for the educational orientation of the Center sounds like a UNESCO document, full of the best intentions but hoping vaguely to offer all things to all men. The formal Center *teaching* program has evidently in fact boiled down to occasional guest lectures and visitations by active film-makers. Although some 900 films are reportedly screened yearly (half of these for oral-history projects) they are very badly attended by the fellows, and are largely American features, which hardly constitute the total universe of important films. (Sometimes, indeed, nobody at all shows up for the screenings, not even the person who requested them; and a rule has had to be established that a film will be run if only one person turns up for it.)

It is no news to the older film schools, that it is unreasonable in the long haul to expect active film-makers to spend much time at a school, although they are glad to come for an occasional appearance (especially if, as AFI has now begun to do, this gets on television). But if it is hard to bring film-makers to the students, why not take students to the film-makers through apprenticeships, as has long been customary in other arts?

Moreover, the existence of the Center has tended to distort over-all AFI budgeting. Heavy Center expenses (partly but not entirely connected with large and unplanned outlays on a feature being produced by one of the fellows, Stanton Kaye) have drained away funds that should have been spent on archives, research, and education on a national level. In the state of the theatrical industry today, production of features is extremely risky; it will be extraordinary indeed, despite Stevens's optimism on this score, if the Kaye picture actually produces income for AFI. In any event, feature production on this financial scale ($250,000 or more) is clearly something that needs to be undertaken by normal venture capital: when a production goes this enormously over budget, it should stop until further venture capital is secured. (The AFI is not the Swedish Film Institute with its large tax-derived production funds.)

It is difficult to venture compact recommendations concerning the Center, but part of the difficulty is precisely that the Center is so heavily implicated with the rest of the AFI. Therefore, I propose that the principle of many-small-organizations-are-better-than-one-big-one be applied:

The Center for Advanced Film Studies should be spun off into an entirely separate organization, with its own Board of Trustees and Director. If the Ford foundation is, as Stevens maintains, interested in supporting a film conservatory, by all means let it do so. Greystone is now equipped for the purpose, and can evidently be maintained physically at a cost of something like $700,000 per year. But let the Center exist on its own, so that the AFI will be free of its weight—organizational, administrative, and financial. The policy of having one man attempt to run both organizations seems clearly mistaken. It is charged by his critics that George Stevens, Jr. puts down $60,000 per year; it is replied by his friends that he works hard. What is needed, however, is not one man struggling to do a $60,000 job, but two men doing $30,000 jobs without stretching themselves as thin as Stevens has to. The necessity to try and manage the Center as well as AFI as a whole, it seems to me after extensive talks with him, has meant that Stevens has not been focusing proper policy-making energy on general AFI priorities since he went to Los Angeles. Greystone has, it seems to me, been far closer to Stevens's main personal interests than his work in managing the AFI's other areas; certainly it connects more directly with his prior experience as a film producer with USIA and earlier, not to mention his family background in the feature industry. It may be, therefore, that both he and his constituency would be happier if the AFI and Center are split, and he directs the Center. It seems clear, at any rate, that Stevens has little taste for trying to turn AFI into an aggressively national organization in wide and direct contact with film-concerned people on every level.

The disparity between Stevens's approach and what is needed becomes clearer if we turn to an examination of other areas of AFI work, but before doing so let me list a number of recommendations concerning the spun-off Center itself:

An apprenticeship period should be required of all resident fellows, and a nationwide apprenticeship program should be established, not only with theatrical feature directors but also makers of documentaries and experimental films of every kind. An expanded fellowship program should also be established for scholars and critics, and this program too should assist both resident fellows and fellows who wish to carry out programs at established centers of film study, whether universities or such institutions as the Museum of Modern Art, the Cinematheque Française, etc. The program for resident fellows should not be confined to beginning scholars as at present, but should be partly *(only* partly) modeled on research centers in other fields, where established scholars are offered a year in a "hothouse" atmosphere.

Second, *the staff of the Center should be expected to develop a theoretical rationale for their work* which relates to the general situation not merely of the American film but of film as a worldwide art form. This rationale should not denigrate theory and criticism or be otherwise intellectually provincial.

Third, *there should be a minimum of special showings at the Center* and what there are should be publicized; instead fellows should be encouraged to participate in the general on-going life of exhibitions, discussions, and publications in their city. (As explained further below, AFI should, once it is rid of the Center, undertake an active regional role and do some screenings itself in convenient central locations.)

Fourth, *fellows should have a voice in management of the Center*, through some democratic mechanism, particularly as regards allocation of production budgets; this would impel them to develop skills in articulating their proposals and developing principled arguments on their behalf, through being involved in a real social process.

Regionalism

Since some of the recommendations which follow are not within the power of AFI as it is presently organized, let me first outline how it seems to me AFI should function in its national role. It has been recognized by all, since the first discussions of an Institute, that the geography of this country is a terrible obstacle. If our culture and our film industry were centered in one place, as is true of London, Paris, and indeed most capitals, the Institute could be located there and centralized functions would be appropriate in many areas. (Though the British Film Institute, for example, is now engaged in a regional theaters program.) As a creation of the federal government, AFI found itself in Washington, a singularly unfilm-minded city. An abortive branch office was opened in New York; then the Center was established at Greystone, and the center of gravity of the organization shifted to the West.

It seems crucial to recognize that a successful AFI must be dedicated to promoting the film interests of *all* regions of the country, and must be in close touch with the varying problems of those regions. Thus, *regional offices should be opened in Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and perhaps other cities as well.* Unlike Greystone, these offices should be located in easily accessible places; they should provide modest screening facilities capable of being opened to the public, with a public coffeeshop adjacent thereto where film people could meet; informal events and presentations could be held, etc. Compact office space should be provided for a small staff, whose primary responsibilities would include coordinating work on distribution problems, aiding and advising educational programs, and reporting events and developments to the national office and *AFI Reports*. This staff would encourage the development of a network of advisory and ad hoc committees drawn from the local film community (broadly conceived to include educators, film makers, students, critics, industry members, and persons from the general public who care about films). The staff would also be concerned to develop a general public membership program. In short, they would act as guilties, inspirations, stimulators, trouble-shooters; they would go out and *engage* with the film problems of the country, and attempt to bring AFI's prestige, influence, and money to bear in solving them.

One important task of the AFI regional offices would be the development of regional theaters, either directly under AFI auspices like the one in Washington, or through assisting local museums or other groups in the manner of the BFI. Unfortunately, the Washington theater has been so expensive that its experience will tend to frighten off those interested in beginning other theaters. After modest and quite successful beginnings, the Washington theater was moved to a high-rent shopping center where its losses have been spectacular (on the order of $100,000 per year). Next year it goes to the Kennedy Art Center, but expensive outfitting is involved there too, and Stevens foresees another $100,000 deficit. Instead of working toward other regional theaters directly, however, AFI policy is now to put on "spectaculars" in collaboration with big department stores, as has been done in Minneapolis and Houston. These operate through high-powered hoopla of stars and big names; they garner a few memberships, but it seems extremely unlikely that the Official Culture types who attend them will constitute the backbone of a repertory theater audience, while it seems all too likely that this kind of show will alienate the young people who in fact constitute such a potential audience.

The AFI Theater in Washington should be returned to its former modest level of operation, with expenses kept relatively in line with income. It should be operated as a conscious pilot program to explore how self-sustaining theaters can be maintained in cities lacking large film-mad populations. The essentials should be modesty in "image," active and daring programming (as has been the case in Washington), and active attempts to connect the theater with community interests and needs.

Presumably, if AFI must continue to rely on government funds, its headquarters office should be in Washington, despite the cultural disadvantages of that city.

Research and Publications

Returning to the other main areas of AFI activity, what has been happening in the past six months is a cutting back of programs as AFI has run out of money. Stevens claims that production people have been fired too; but the ire of the education and critical community was most directly raised by the firing of the Center research staff; shortly thereafter, not only Education Manager Ron Sutton in Washington, but also Steven's administrative assistant Kay Loveland resigned; and a petition of protest was then signed by a large number of people still remaining on the staff, on both coasts. In such circumstances bitterness is natural. Stevens claims that just as much research and education work is going on now as before. But what he means is the oral history program; and as far as participants at the recent educators conference in St. Louis can tell, AFI is hoping to cast them loose as soon as possible. It seems clear, then, that an important change of emphasis *has* taken place. But it is not easy to evaluate the past or present contributions of AFI in the research or scholarly area.

Skepticism is inevitable because scholarly work is one thing that institutions are never good at; they serve best by providing libraries or similar facilities and leaving the scholars alone. Judging by the evidence of our American universities, the "community of scholars" Robert Hutchins spoke of cannot be willed

into existence simply by hiring scholars and putting them in one building; it springs up sometimes in some places through a happy concatenation of circumstances. What was going on at the Center seems to have been preparatory in nature. Seminars were held; discussions were carried out; books were envisioned. One project bore on the nature of visual style in film, hoping to develop a suitable vocabulary for analysis. A study was afoot on animation, and several on historical aspects of Hollywood film-making and film-makers. The role of the paid staff was to assist the fellows doing these projects through discussion and advice; and there was some overlap with management of the oral histories projects. Some of the work planned may come to publication stage in due course, when it can be evaluated by all. On the other hand, those staff or fellows who have in fact published critical work (Jim Kitses, Paul Schrader, Steven Mamber, Bob Mundy, and others) would doubtless have gone on producing whether the Center existed or not, and whether or not they happened to be in Los Angeles, London, or New York.

The oral histories program, which is continuing after the firings (management of it is not, after all, a terribly complex job) involves both experienced and published interviewers and beginners. We can confidently rely on the knowledge and interviewing skills of Gavin Lambert on Cukor, Albert Johnson on Wellman and Leroy, Charles Higham on Garmes, Peter Bogdanovich on Dwan, Walsh, and McCarey, or Kevin Brownlow. But only later will we be able to assess the 30 other projects now underway. It must also be remembered that although oral histories serve to preserve the memories and opinions of important industry figures, they are only the beginning of scholarly work, and certainly do not constitute film history in themselves. There is a tendency to think of tape-recording as fulfilling the duties of a scholar; but the tapes only provide a partial basis for the difficult process of sorting out truths, exaggerations, falsehoods; for seeing through the opacities of events and films to what actually happened and what it meant. If the oral history program results only in tapes, and not in the writing of history, it will be a failure.

Partial support was given to *Filmfacts* magazine, and various bulletins were published, plus a guide to college film courses.

For the rest, no scholarly or research publications have been issued by the AFI itself. A series of transcribed guest discussions is now planned; but judging from the first, with Fellini, these will be pleasant conversations but hardly significant contributions to film thought. (The Fellini booklet has the attraction of being modestly printed, though apparently its cost was far from modest.)

If we assume that AFI policy should be directed toward furthering the highest levels of research and scholarship in film, it is clear that a drastic reordering and rethinking is required. AFI has spent something like $450,000 in the "publications and research" area. Aside from the above-noted items, this has bought some extraordinarily expensive rumination about the problems of putting out a general film magazine that would appeal to everybody, which is now acknowledged to be impossible (as those of us already active in the field have always maintained). As Kay Loreland notes, "It is hard to believe that this much money has been spent with so little result"; and those of us who work in more rigorously administered organizations can hardly help concluding that a great deal of extravagance and carelessness have been involved. While it seems that no actual malfeasance has occurred, the AFI has evidently been run by the loose standards usual in the big-money world of foundation grants, where "image," plentiful assistants, and insulation from accountability are the rule, and count for more than mere humdrum work. $450,000 is a modest number in this world, but consider what it might have bought (after deducting 10% for overhead and administration): it is enough to provide royalty advances (part of which could have been regained and recycled to further projects) of $5,000 for 40 books plus $10,000 for 20 more; or enough to subsidize the entire printing costs of about 50 film books; or enough to pay the deficits of all America's film magazines for at least a decade; or enough to commission, edit, print and distribute gratis some 135 modestly printed scholarly monographs of perhaps 100 pages each.

Further developments in this area could obviously become very complex, but for a beginning we could recommend that, in an AFI from which the Center has been spun off:

A program of grants and royalty-advance funding should be established to aid researchers who cannot secure regular commercial royalty advances for their projects. One special area where heavy commitments of time and energy are involved is history; attention should be given not to committee-style work in

history, but to backing mature scholars capable of undertaking large-scale synthetic histories, both of American film and film worldwide. Scholars and critics should be encouraged to utilize the oral history materials for what they are: raw materials toward the writing of analytic and historical works.

AFI should itself publish some special-interest works of too limited an audience to interest regular publishers, whether these are by AFI-supported writers or not. The decision to publish should always be a separate decision from research-grant decisions. Some examples of useful materials which cannot at present find a market are: short monographs, longer than articles, shorter than books; certain types of scripts; studies of organizational problems in the film field.

AFI should continue and expand the AFI Reports publication so that it becomes a truly national newsletter, not merely about AFI activities, but about all film events of more than purely commercial or routine interest. It should be very rapid in its publication schedule and modest in appearance, rather on the lines of two worthy predecessors, *Canyon Cinema News* and *New Canadian Film*. This is particularly important because of its great usefulness in building a national membership organization. Such a publication, if modestly staffed (one person) and aggressively edited, would be virtually self-sustaining.

Research and reference service should be maintained in connection with the National Film Catalog; for practical reasons, such as the great concentration of archive and library resources (and writers) there, a reference officer should probably be located in New York, although the Library of Congress makes Washington a possibility. This service should, like its excellent counterpart at the British Film Institute, assist scholars and critics doing research, film-makers and industry people needing information, and AFI staff who need assistance.

Education

The research staff at the Center assisted the education staff (based in the East) by various kinds of consultation and advice. In an AFI from which the Center has been spun off, the education department should be responsible for its own research work.

There are two levels on which "education" is a proper function of AFI. The most crucial is assisting the development of the widespread ferment of screenings, discussions, publications, and beginning film-making which must exist as the compost from which major artists and films will hopefully grow. Work on this level, as carried out by the regional offices, should be democratic in the best sense, taking no account of official qualifications or social distinctions: it would be excessive to expect that a juvenile delinquent, deserter, and general no-good like the young Francois Truffaut would be appointed a Fellow but we must demand that he would be admitted to screenings and discussions like anybody else—just as he was, in fact, at the Cinémathèque and at the ciné-clubs around the Latin Quarter in Paris.

The other level is assistance to formalized education, which practically speaking means chiefly high schools, since colleges tend to be jealous of their prerogatives. British film teachers on both secondary and college levels (aided by their own association and now the BFI) have been exploring this area for many years; our problem is to recapitulate their experience as quickly as possible, and to push ahead with our own. AFI has worked hard to bring us up to date: holding seminars for teachers, providing guidance, teaching suggestions, reassurance, and information. In general, this program went forward well, and laid the foundation for regional groups of teachers who are now, with the cutback in AFI funds, contemplating formation of their own national organization—surely a useful development, for which AFI should provide seed money. (The educators also propose to elect an AFI Trustee from their membership, and this would provide a bit of leavening to the nomination process by which the Board members are now selected.)

As in the research area, we can here only suggest a few basic aims for the education department, which should be funded as a major AFI effort:

Experimentation with teaching methods, as was done in the "model curricula sites" program, should be resumed, and their results published.

A quarterly journal written by and published for film teachers should be established, along the lines of the British screen.

Regional and national seminars should be held periodically for the exchange of ideas, until such time as these can be replaced by conventions of the national teachers association.

Education officers in the regional AFI offices should hold meetings, seminars, showings, and other events useful in developing film education in their areas.

CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION

The Board of Trustees which controls AFI evolved through a series of committees appointed by the federal Arts Council; key people in the early stages were Gregory Peck, William Pereira (a former art director and now architect), George Stevens, Sr., and an actress named Elizabeth Ashley. In due course George Stevens, Jr. became involved; the Stanford Research Institute was hired to produce a report on what a film institute ought to do; and by the time the actual first Board was constituted, basic policy was set. Thereafter the Board has been a self-perpetuating body (its members pick their own successors, on a staggered schedule). It is a heavily Establishment board, with a token independent filmmaker or two. But since this is an Establishment-run society, there is perhaps nothing to object to about this *if* the board delivers the goods. Two kinds of "goods" are required, before we can conclude that the board is doing its job: money and aggressive policy making.

The money question will be resolved, one way or the other, shortly after this issue of *EQ* appears. Funds for the next fiscal year are being sought from the National Endowment for the Arts and from private sources (mostly in the industry); some Ford Foundation funding will carry over. In future, *Board members should be expected to actively support fund-raising work.*

As far as policy goes, the Board's central mistake has been to ignore the distribution area—and the potential for nationwide involvement and support which lay in regional offices and regional theaters. A "commission" to study distribution problems is now being proposed by Stevens, but this seems too little, and it is unquestionably too late. Parallel to this fundamental distortion of policy are the developments associated with the Center: if the education, research, information, and publications programs should look outward, involving themselves with film people everywhere, the Center looks inward, spending very large sums that touch only a handful of people.

Since the Board controls the balance of AFI outlays, it is the Board's responsibility to lay down firm program outlines for Stevens and the staff. The Board however, is a large and unwieldly body; it meets rarely. Real responsibility rests with its executive committee: Gregory Peck, Arnold Picker of United Artists, Arthur Penn, Jack Valenti of the MPAA, John Culkin, David Mallery, and John Schneider of CBS. It is to these men, along with Stevens himself, that responsibility for AFI's performance falls.

Part of the problem in the administration of AFI, and therefore in evaluating its performance in different areas, lies in the amorphousness of the organization. As far as I can tell, everything of any importance (plus a great deal which is not) is decided by Stevens personally; there are not even really any official "departments," though people have been sometimes appointed "managers"; outlays of money have remained tightly in Steven's hands. During the financial crisis of the past year or so, a great deal of budgetary reshuffling seems to have taken place, with the overall result being a relative transfer of resources so that the Center has prospered and the other aspects of AFI work have shrunk. It seems to me that the Board's responsibility could be fulfilled thus:

The Board should establish plain and explicit policies in the various areas of AFI operation (after spinning off the Center as a separate organization). *Each major area should have a fixed and public yearly budget*, and it should be administered as a Department, with a manager who meets occasionally with trustees to discuss the Department's problems and needs. The Board should also employ a comptroller to supervise budgets and expenditures, and the general outlines of AFI expenses should be routinely publicized to maintain public confidence.

Many charges have been made by fired staff members and their supporters concerning financial waste and general mismanagement by Stevens and his associates. Kay Loveland, Stevens' former administrative assistance, has written that "Not all these administrative expenditures taken individually are unnecessary, but as a whole they add up to a life style more appropriate to a successful profit-making movie studio than to a struggling young non-profit organization. So often needless expenditures were made because the lack of a guiding vision resulted in far more money being spent in too few areas." She also charges that "Throughout AFI's existence, staff morale has been very low and employees have remained almost continually frustrated and dismayed at management policies and practices, both toward individuals and departmental programs. Confronted with gross salary inequities (the AFI Director made $75,000 [cut to $60,000 in the crisis], the education manager $13,000); negligible fringe benefits (in California employees were not protected by unemployment and disability insurance for almost two years), and management's failure to develop clear and fair employment and severance policies, staff have felt used and dispensable."

Devotion to a good cause does not excuse an organization from its obligation to provide rational personnel policies, and both the recent uproar and earlier staff grumbling indicate that *the Board should require management to develop explicit procedures and standards in the personnel area.* The staff should also realize that, despite their professional status in many instances, they also play the role of employees, and need some kind of organization through which they can represent their interests to management.

It was characteristic of the process by which such organizations as AFI are formed that Colin Young, who had led the discussions that first mobilized sentiment on behalf of a film institute, and who had more ideas about what such an institute should do than anybody else around, was not invited to sit on the Board of Trustees. When I asked Stevens why, among all the people who had done scholarly, critical, or university level film teaching in this country, only Arthur Knight (who has excellent high level industry connections) was on the Board, Stevens allowed that he just couldn't understand how such an oversight had occurred. Knight has of course been an extremely valuable member of the Board; but the persistent exclusion of all others who have done serious intellectual work in the American film world is perhaps the major "symbolic" reason why AFI so lacks friends among those people who loved film before it came to the attention of the big foundations; and it goes far to explain certain biases of AFI operations. *The Board should include several additional members who have done original and important thinking about film as an art (historians, teachers, critics) and can help redress the balance that has tipped so far in the direction of production.* This indeed seems to me the most critical recommendation that can be made; without such a move, support for AFI will continue to erode almost everywhere outside the walls of Greystone.

As far as I can tell, very few people in the film world want the American Film Institute to die. Too many high hopes have been attached to it for anyone to write it off easily; and it has accomplished its tasks of archive and film-maker support with distinction. Its potential for helping to develop a national film culture is large. However, many people are troubled by what seems to them an imbalance in AFI priorities, and by the signs of internal personnel difficulties. What is needed, therefore, if AFI is to successfully regroup after its present financial crisis and go forward into a second phase of existence, is a wholesale reexamination and reordering of AFI priorities. If a new consensus can be achieved on what AFI ought to be doing, this could serve as the basis for a genuine constituency that could help AFI survive in the long run—both through direct membership support and through political pressure aimed at fuller government support, which is the source of money for all other film institutes in the world. (The BFI gets some $1,800,000 yearly, and BFI income from publications, admissions, etc. is almost as great; the BFI, however, also operates the national archive, which here is a responsibility of the Library of Congress.) If the Center can be spun off and AFI policies turned around, AFI will only have begun to fight on behalf of the art. If that cannot be accomplished, the struggle is already over, and we can begin preparing inscriptions to be engraved somewhere at Greystone.

THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE,
CENTER FOR ADVANCED FILM STUDIES,
Beverly Hills, Calif., July 29, 1974.

MR. GEORGE STEVENS, JR.,
MR. CHARLTON HESTON,
The American Film Institute,
Beverly Hills, Calif.

DEAR SIRS: We the undersigned present Fellows of The American Film Institute are extremely distressed to learn of the impending resignation of Dean Frank Daniel. It is our deep feeling that Frank is the most important and valuable asset that the Center has in its acknowledged purpose—the education of future filmmakers. Frank is largely responsible for the fine and substantive programs that exist today.

We the undersigned also find ourselves strongly in agreement with Frank Daniel's position on the specific issues which have precipitated the action of his resignation. We fervently urge you to reconsider your present position on the operating policies concerning finances and personnel now under dispute.

Respectfully,

SAMUEL GROSSMAN
(and 32 others).
JULY 29, 1974.

MR. GEORGE STEVENS, JR.

We, former fellows of the Center for Advanced Film Studies, emphatically urge you not to accept the resignation of Frank Daniel.

We consider Frank irreplaceable. His instruction and inspiration has been a vital influence on our careers as directors and screenwriters. Insofar as the Center has a soul, it is Frank.

To lose a man of Frank's value because he finds certain conditions at the Center intolerable is itself intolerable to us.

We strongly believe that Frank must be reinstated fully at the Center and that he be allowed to continue his valuable work without interference.

Respectfully,

THOMAS RICKMAN
(And 9 others).

THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE
CENTER FOR ADVANCED FILM STUDIES,
Beverly Hills, Calif., August 2, 1974.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES:

We, the present and former fellows of the American Film Institute Center for Advanced Film Studies, wish to express our absolute and adamant opposition to the Executive Committee's decision to accept the resignation of Frank Daniel as Dean of the Center. We have been told that the decision is final and that further debate is useless. We wish for you to know in the strongest terms that the decision is not final as far as we are concerned. We do not accept the resignation.

Dean Daniel did not submit his resignation because he wanted to lightly abandon the work he has accomplished over the past years at a time when the Center is at last beginning to show its value. Rather he was driven to such means to dramatize the impossible conditions under the current mode of operation. We believe that the Committee has deliberately blinded itself to what Frank is trying to say.

In our letters and petitions, an earnest attempt has been made to keep the issue from becoming one of personalities—yet at the meeting at which we were told of the Executive Committee's fait accompli, it became obvious that personalities were in fact the issue. As the Executive Committee members put it, "it came down to a matter of supporting either the Director (George Stevens Jr.) or Frank—we chose to support the Director." That this is an admission of the Committee's refusal to face the issues Frank Daniel raised is painfully obvious. We find any decision made on such a basis unworthy of the American Film Institute.

Dean Daniel expressed himself willing to negotiate; his complaints and proposals were recognized as valid—yet the Board, through the Executive Committee, seems willing to lose him and leave these conditions uncorrected in order to preserve their notions of "authority." They chose to regard Dean Daniel's proposals as an ultimatum by him and to declare them unacceptable rather than trying to solve the problems which precipitated the proposals. Indeed, the proposals were off handedly characterized as "impossible," with the implication that they were unreasonable and radical. In fact, the proposals do not substantially differ from those which University film schools govern themselves by, and in fact were based on charters already in long use by University film schools.

As far as we are concerned, this matter is far from closed. We believe that Dean Daniel's value to the Center is too great to lose in this manner. Until now,

the Board of Trustees has not been informed properly of the problems that exist at the Center from the staff, faculty, fellows and most importantly, from Dean Daniel. They have instead accepted George Stevens Jr.'s highly personal point of view. If this were not the case, this present crisis would not exist.

We insist that Dean Daniel's resignation not be accepted until further discussions are held and a genuine attempt is made to discover the validity of his proposals and complaints. Furthermore, we resent the fact that we, the present fellows, who are most immediately involved in the Center and its policies were neither consulted or informed by the Committee until their decision had been made. We insist that our thoughts and feelings be taken into account to correct this unfortunate situation. The manner in which this situation was handled is intolerable to us.

Respectfully yours,

LONDON SMITH
(and 44 others).

[From Variety, Aug. 28, 1974]

DANIEL RESIGNATION ACCEPTED BY AFI; WON BATTLE, LOST WAR IN TANGLE OVER 'BUREAUCRACY'

(By A. D. Murphy)

At an unprecedented seven-hour session Thursday night (22) in N.Y. which ran until nearly midnight, the executive committee of the American Film Institute plus six outside participating trustees reaffirmed, with only one dissent, the decision to accept the resignation of Frank Daniel as dean of AFI's Centr for Advanced Film Studies. Action came after exactly three weeks of controversy following the earlier Aug. 1 decision. However, the documented troubles of AFI CAFS have begun to be aired, and momentum for rehabilitation is continuing.

The lone opposition to reaffirming Daniel's exit came from independent filmmaker Ed Emshwiller, one of a group of outside trustees who came to exec committee member John Schneider's CBS office for the evening-long session. AFI trustees chairman Charlton Heston 10 days ago invited any interested outside trustees to the scheduled exec committee meeting.

While only six such trustees stayed through the long meeting to vote, there also were reported in attendance Eleanor Perry, Marvin Josephson, David Mallery, Shana Alexander, John Macy, Stephen O. Frankfurt, and Henry Rogers. Alexander was among the reported duo who did not remain for the final vote.

Exec committee members on hand were Richard Brandt, David Brown, Schneider and Heston (Roy White, the fourth member who also worked on the problem of Daniel's resignation last month, was reported absent on vacation; David Picker is in Europe and Frank Yablans is on a business holiday in L.A.).

Also present was AFI director George Stevens Jr., who in previous trustee sessions had kept a relatively low and distant profile. New AFI-West Director Martin Manulis also was present.

An unusual participant was Jonathan Avnet, one of 45 CAFS fellows who had spoken out strongly about Daniel's exit, and who, as spokesman for the fellows, was invited by Heston to address the trustees. Avnet's presentation was considered exemplary by all present. Daniel himself also was on hand to make his presentation, at Heston's invitation, and reiterate his proposals for a strengthened CAFS operation and local control.

In the course of the meeting, a lot of what are becoming known as the "Greystone horrors" (cumbersome administrative procedures vis-a-vis CAFS and AFI's Washington h.q., where accounting and other matters are centralized) were spelled out, but not all were effectively laid at the feet of Daniel, whose forte was acknowledged as education and not administration. At one point, Stevens was asked how things could have deteriorated so badly; his reported response was that the recent appointment of Manulis was designed precisely to rectify the bureaucratic snarls.

AFI's official handout on Friday (23) reveals publicly a major achievement of the fellows—that they will be permitted to address the full board of about 40

trustees at its next meeting, now targeted for sometime in October and understood being relocated to L.A. for maximum participation. The AFI announcement says that the fellows will, at the board meeting, "discuss the future activities" of CAFS.

Not specifically stated in the AFI announcement is a reported pledge that the fellows henceforth will be invited to participate in all CAFS policy discussions, including the selection of a new dean. On that latter point, the announcement says that the existing CAFS advisory committee will be charged with the search for a new dean, and also with CAFS faculty restructuring.

While Avnet represented the majority of fellows, there was introduced at the meeting a letter from another unidentified fellow more critical of Daniel. Daniel's next course of action is not yet clear—whether to withdraw from the scene entirely (considered possible), or else to continue to speak informally to trustees outlining CAFS restructuring suggestions, but no longer from the posture of one seeking reinstatement.

However, as more than one person close to the situation has conceded, "Frank lost the battle but won the war"—meaning that he, like Frank Serpico or some other figure in classic tragedy, brought serious internal matters to the surface, but paid for it with his job. The Daniel affair is now considered the most serious tumult in AFI history, but one which has intrigued and crystallized the interest of many trustees, most of whom readily concede their lack of precise internal awareness of AFI's working machinery amidst a preoccupation with fund raising, itself a vital function of the board and management.

Past Discontent

A lot of festering frustrations have come to the fore in the Daniel matter, reviving almost inevitably some lesser discontent from the past, as evidenced in trustee Raymond Fielding's letter listing 10 key departures over the last three years. (Stevens is understood to have responded to Fielding, in part saying that many former key execs went on to better jobs.)

As a result, AFI would seem to have an immediate challenge in assuring outsiders (foundations, educators, potential donors, etc.) that management is on the track in its organization goals and administration. In addition, the challenge internally is to satisfy trustees, fellows and staff that the reforms are being genuinely studied and implemented, accompanied by a management attitude totally free of reprisals on the fellows who stuck their necks out on this issue.

Hence, the coming months will demand evidence of shaping up that has both form as well as substance. Form alone will not suffice, since the Daniel affair has exposed problem areas to trustees (whether the board members wanted to be so exposed or not) whose legal, moral and fiduciary responsibilities cannot be ignored.

Substantive improvement will polish the currently dull image of CAFS which, while not the sole facet of AFI, properly is considered one of its crown jewels. Out of the Daniel affair has come some momentum which is most likely to survive his absence.

Fielding's Letter

Fielding's letter to Heston, dated Aug. 11, was also sent to Stevens and to all AFI trustees. The complete text follows:

"I recall that at the time that I joined the board of trustees of the AFI, the organization's reputation and credibility—at least in academic, foundation, and governmental circles—was pretty low. With the recent resignations of Frank Daniel on the west coast and Sali Ann Kriegsman on the east, I would guess that it is now about zero.

"Within the last two-three years, the turnover of first-rate people on the Institute's staff has been absurdly high. Those that I know of include Dave Shepard, Sam Kula, Bob Geller, Ron Sutton, Dave Thaxton, Richard Kline, Roger Heller, Joe Dispenza, Frank Daniel, and Sali Ann Kriegsman. I have worked closely, over the years, with Shepard, Kula, Thaxton, Daniel and Kriegsman, and am familiar with the work of Sutton and Geller, and I have the highest regard for all their talents and energy, as does everyone in our field. (I am not as familiar with the work of Kline, Dispenza and Heller, and so cannot comment upon their departures).

42-830—74——11

"I don't know how such things are rationalized in private industry, but I can say from experience that in academic and civil service administration, turnover of this many first-rate people in so short a time is considered a prima facie case of either a faulty operational philosophy or incompetent management.

"I am also disturbed that we have not had a meeting of the full board of trustees since January. So far as I have been able to determine, no date has yet been set for a fall meeting.

"As a trustee, I want to be as helpful and constructive as possible, and not to cause any more waves than necessary during this difficult period in the history of the Institute. I appreciate the fact that under ordinary circumstances, the proper role for a trustee is to provide support and encouragement to the administrators of the organization, and to avoid unnecessary meddling in their work.

"However, I must confess that I am beginning to worry about my own reputation and credibility in this matter. Increasingly, I am being asked by people in the academic world, the foundations, and the Washington community to explain what in God's name is going on within the AFI, and I find that I have no answers to give them—not even constructively dishonest ones.

"I would like to urge that a meeting of the board of trustees be scheduled in late September or October, at which the director and the executive committee members can review these matters for us and explain their meaning and significance. The people who serve on the board have given a great deal in the way of time, energy, and (in many cases) financial support, and are entitled to know what has gone wrong—or right, as the case may be. Cordially, Raymond Fielding."

REPORT ON THE CONFERENCE ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF FILM CENTERS AND SERVICES.—MUSEUM OF MODERN ART, NEW YORK CITY, AND MOHONK MOUNTAIN HOUSE, NEW PALTZ, NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 13–15, 1973

Michael Webb summarized his paper "Better Movies for More People: Creating a Network of Regional Film Theaters."

Webb toured 30 cities in the previous year to explore ways for the A.F.I. to assist regional exhibition programs. This culminated in a January 1973 conference on regional exhibition put on by the A.F.I. in Washington. Representatives from 20 institutions, many of them museums, attended the conference.

A.F.I. proposed to provide a mechanism through which programs could be toured, including series developed by both the A.F.I. and by other institutions. A network of exhibition facilities, Webb emphasized, could help to cut costs in the area of shipping, rental, and publicity materials, especially if the A.F.I. had prior guarantees from a given number of theaters to take A.F.I. programs.

At the same time, Webb said, A.F.I. did not want to impose or dictate programs to the regions.

Webb outlined three conditions for participation in the network: (1) quality 16mm and 35mm projection to guarantee care of scarce and valuable prints; (2) genuine interest in ambitious programming and promotion; and (3) a desire on the part of museums to become service centers in order to educate and enlarge the film-going audience.

Participants raised objections to the A.F.I. plan, saying regional centers should be encouraged to develop their own programming, rather than simply having packaged programming "sold" to them by the A.F.I. These participants viewed the A.F.I. approach as a "centralist" one where the A.F.I. would control regional exhibition rather than serving it.

It was suggested that the A.F.I. serve more as a booking agency that could serve local desires and initiative.

Another participant argued that regional programs most needed help in learning "the craft of film exhibition," including how to run high quality, low overhead, highly accessible film programs. The "marble mausoleum" approach of the A.F.I.'s exhibition program was criticized.

Webb was asked if a regional theater would have to accept a certain number of A.F.I. screenings to take part in the program. Webb said this was not necessary. He added that the A.F.I.'s long-term goal would be to provide individual films for individual institutions for specific needs.

It was suggested that many regions could not successfully use specialized packages, while the general packages were too vacuous for some of the more developed exhibition programs. Webb said that there was an attempt to achieve a common denominator in programming to facilitate lower costs.

It was pointed out that there was a difference between art museums which showed films and regional centers. Most museums do not have a film curator or specialist on staff, while the regional centers specialize in film exhibition. It was suggested that the A.F.I. should make personnel training for exhibition its main priority in this area. It was noted that the Pacific Film Archive had suggested such an internship program to the Ford Foundation in 1972.

It was argued that A.F.I. should be as responsive as possible to the specific needs of regions and individuals because it is a national organization funded by taxpayers.

The session closed with a brief discussion of film programming for children. This was seen as an area neglected by commercial houses.

This session began with Sam Kula summarizing his plan for the establishing of regional "core collections," as outlined in his paper "The Proper Study of Film: Building of a Core Collection."

The first question dealt with who would own prints in the core collection. Kula said that each center would enter into a bilateral agreement with the producer of each title in the collection.

Asked about funding, Kula said that perhaps the study center would put up the money to purchase the prints, or perhaps a foundation or the federal government would put up the money for the regional centers. He also suggested that AFI might try to raise money to place prints in each of the selected regional centers.

Kula emphasized that to get the prints, a guarantee of good behavior in regard to care and use of the prints would be necessary. There would have to be a certification procedure whereby the study centers could police themselves or be policed.

Several participants inquired how the initial list of titles for the core collection was made. Kula said the titles were "a reflection of what is," and he explained that the titles were chosen after checking the most popular film texts and available course curriculums to indicate which films were most frequently used. He added he didn't expect absolute agreement on the 500 titles. He emphasized that the important thing was not the particular titles involved, but the establishment of a mechanism. Once the mechanism was set up it could be used for any title.

Participants were curious to know how pressures applied by non-theatrical distributors on the majors could be lessened. Kula stated that non-theatrical distributors would be involved in the setting up of any mechanism. He also felt that uses of the core collection in the study center would not threaten the classroom market of the non-theatrical distributors.

Peter Feinstein of the University Film Study Center said that when he attempted to negotiate deals with distributors he often had trouble making them understand that the Study Center was not a non-theatrical or commercial exhibitor, but was a "new animal."

Kula asked the conference participants for a consensus that the core collection is a viable concept and an agreement that a set of standards for the operation of a study collection could be drawn up and adhered to.

A museum-based participant noted that even though museums do not qualify for the agreement because they lack a "study orientation," they could benefit from such a collection. Once films are owned, it is not unusual to pay substantially reduced rentals to show the films publicly.

In response to the chairman's call for a show of hands, nine people indicated they represented institutions that wanted a study core collection; none wanted to negotiate for themselves. This brought up the question of whether they were willing to have the AFI negotiate for them.

Kula was asked why the AFI does not involve on every project a participatory group that represents the people in the given field.

Kula replied that this was not the policy of the AFI. He also said it was difficult to establish a truly representative committee in any case.

It was stated that the people attending this conference were as representative of film study centers as any group one could find in the United States.

A participant stated that the basic problem was control. Difficult materials cannot be obtained without a system of certification. Under the AFI system, the AFI would control certification of regional study centers. This would lay certification control in the hands of the executive committee of the AFI. People on this committee, it was argued, had opposed regional development in the past.

Kula stated that his suggestion was that a national association be founded. This association would be made up of representatives of several organizations which would accredit and monitor the study centers.

A number of participants indicated that they did not trust the AFI to properly carry out this project. A number of reasons were given. It was said that the interests and needs of film educators, filmmakers and university film people had been consistently ignored by the AFI. Participants who had been deeply involved in film study had not been consulted or even informed of the development of the core collection concept. It was said that minutes of the meeting in Washington on the core collection were written in such a way as to serve the purposes of the AFI and did not, in fact, represent or reflect the ideas of those who attended. One participant felt that the core collection concept was being presented in the conference as a "fait accompli" and not as a sincere desire for consultation. It was said that the Institute was so constituted so as to make it impossible for it to represent the best interests of the film study field. It was also felt that the national feeling of distrust toward the AFI made it unwise to work through them.

The mood was clear that conference participants would not at this time commit their organizations to be represented in negotiation by the AFI.

It was felt that any organization set up to negotiate for or to police these centers would have to be representative of the centers and responsible to the centers.

It was stated that the reason for the conference was this very problem of the regional organizations not having any structure or representation offered by existing institutions.

A suggestion was made, inspired by the analogous situation of the AFI St. Louis meeting of regional film teacher organizations which resulted in NAME, that a steering committee be selected from the assembled body to explore these problems further.

This ended the fourth session, although unofficial discussion went on until approximately three a.m.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Ted Perry and I am a professor and chairman of the department of cinema studies at New York University in New York City.

The department's studies are on the undergraduate and graduate program criticism. Some 250 students are working toward M.A. and Ph. D. degrees in this field. We have a program in which some 900 students are enrolled, working toward degrees and certificates in filmmaking and in various areas of film research and some teaching that I have already mentioned.

I bring that out not so much to place myself in a particular concept but to point out what has not been mentioned in the record; that is, that the American Film Institute is not the only organization, group, or institution engaged in the promotion of film, the study of film, the preparation of filmmakers, and certainly the preparation of film teachers.

The point that was made earlier with the appearance of the two women from the very fine program with the American Film Institute should not negate the fact that half of the members of the American Video and Filmmakers Institution are in fact women.

I will, if the chair wishes, at some other time, enter a vitae into the record to demonstrate I have some background in the field of education and I am adviser to the National Project Center of Film and the Humanities, which is an organization involved in what Mr. Peyser referred to earlier as grassroots and film education among the adult population.

I am in the Film Media Panel for the New York State Panel of the Arts, and other organizations directly involved with film study and filmmaking, particularly at the university level.

I have some brief comments I would like to read into the record at this time.

I would like to summarize what I have heard from my colleagues. Of course, I cannot say that I speak for a large number of those or how many I speak for, but I am trying to convey to you the sense of the people with whom I have spoken.

In the first place, there are very positive opinions regarding certain projects done under the auspices of the institute, notably the awards given to independent filmmakers, the preparation of a complete catalog of American films and the preservation of motion picture films that would otherwise disintegrate.

While the American Film Institute was neither the first, nor is it the only organization engaged in such activities, nevertheless it has played a significant role. Every film educator recognizes the enormous importance of these projects and their effect, however delayed and indirect, upon the future of film study.

On the other hand, my colleagues a[illegible] are greatly concerned that this may be all that the institute wishes [illegible] will do for film education. We do not know of other projects, planned or realized, which will benefit film study and the teaching of filmmaking in the 600 colleges and universities now offering such courses.

Where are the plans to support filmmaking and understanding—at other levels of education? How and in what ways does the AFI Center for Advanced Film Study in California relate to similar programs at various universities? We do not know. There is little dialog between the institute and film educators. What plan or interest is there in developing curricular materials for better educating film students, our children, ourselves, to become more literate and critical in our viewing and understanding of film? We do not know.

My impression and experience are that there are no such plans or interest. The education program at the American Film Institute has a very low priority. And I do not think the reason is a lack of funds, but rather a lack of commitment, organization, planning, and concern.

There is, I think, a strong opinion among film educators that it would be a misuse of public funds to place large sums directly into the hands of the American Film Institute. For instance, there is much concern about the close ties between the AFI and the motion picture industry. One should ask, I think, whether or not large amounts of public funds should be used to support, however indirectly, the motion picture industry. I am not asking that the American Film Institute divorce itself from the industry but rather that equal attention be given to the independent filmmaker, the experimentalist, the documentarian, and other filmmakers who have struggled to work outside the restraints that a large industry imposes upon artists.

Perhaps someday I shall be testifying in favor of a bill to fund directly an American Film Institute, for I believe that such an institute should exist, that it should be engaged in a multitude of activities designed to preserve our film heritage, promote its understanding among large sections of the populace, serve as a switchboard for information, and encourage film research and creation.

In the meantime, however, I share the opinion of many others who feel that it would be a mistake, at this time and without further information, to appropriate funds directly for the American Film Institute. It would be a mistake to vest public funds in an institution until that institution has demonstrated an ability and a willingness to work hand in hand with the larger film education community and to be responsive to its needs.

Until that day is here, the proper stewardship of public funds requires that money for film continue to be channeled through the National Endowment for the Arts and other Government agencies which have shown over and over again that they can act imaginatively and responsibly.

It seems to me that the very concept of a national endowment, and the wisdom of its funding by Congress, was that it could and would assemble a staff and expert panels capable of making wise decisions about arts funding. Until the day that the American Film Institute can demonstrate that it can make more prudent and creative use of public money, I think that the proposed bill is a mistake.

No doubt many of us expected too much from the American Film Institute. Some of these expectations were born out of our own needs and some were created by promises uttered by the AFI. Our disappointment has been fed by the consistent failure to live up to those promises and, even more so by the failure of the American Film Institute to create, build upon, consult and serve a broadly based, national constituency. Their failure to consult with film educators, and their insensitivity to the needs of film education are matters of long-standing frustration.

With large grants from the public and private sector, the institute has produced only a few plans, programs, and projects of distinction. It has failed even to get large financial support from the film industry, which certainly ought to be financially committed to the institute. Moreover, the AFI has been beset with numerous internal programs, particularly a large turnover in staff. The education program has had at least four different directors, as I recall.

One rather clear indication of the AFI's position in film education is the rise of several groups and projects whose initial impetus was frustration with the American Film Institute and who felt that they had to organize themselves in order to meet their needs. I am thinking particularly of certain regional film programs, the National Association of Media Educators, and the National Committee on Film and Television Resources and Servers.

I wish that you could hear testimony from all of those people, and from the people in the professional societies of film educators. My personal opinion is that if they were here to testify, a large number would ask that you not support this bill until such time as there is demonstrable evidence that the American Film Institute would at least attempt to use wisely the funds in the interest of film education.

The real issue, then, is the stewardship of public funds. Wisdom dictates that such money only be appropriated for those individuals and organizations who have demonstrated effective, creative, and responsible management, leadership, and organization.

I urge you to take the time in order to collect the testimony and the data necessary to determine whether or not the American Film Institute is such an organization.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Perry's additional remarks follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF CINEMA STUDIES,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., October 17, 1975.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Since testifying before your Select Subcommittee on Education, last October 8th, regarding the American Film Institute, I have had the time to study carefully H.R. 17021, which was not available to me beforehand. While I do not wish to alter my original testimony in any way, nor am I any more in favor of the proposed H.R. 17021, I would like to add several points to the record.

First, I feel that the case is being slightly confused when it appears that one is against the importance of the motion picture as an art form if one is against H.R. 17021. Long before there was an American Film Institute, and during its tenure, there were institutions, such as high schools, colleges, universities, museums, archives, regional study centers, and many other programs making considerable contribution to the education of film makers, the development of a more discerning audience, the preservation of films, public screenings, and the preparation of film teachers and scholars. It is therefore a mistaken assumption that a vote against the proposed bill is a vote against all of these activities, and their importance, since they would continue to be carried on, and might be carried on better, if the bill were defeated.

Second, I would ask that you and your colleagues consider amending two parts of the bill, as it now reads. While I still object to the bill and to the whole idea of centralizing so much power in those few hands, I nevertheless recognize the fact that the bill might be passed and would therefore ask you to consider certain amendments. In the first place, I would hope that you would reconsider the constitution of the board as it is presently outlined in the proposed bill. Anything that can be done to make the board more representative of the field, and more capable of making responsible decisions about film, would be helpful. In this regard, for instance, I am puzzled about why the Secretary of the Interior is to sit on the board. The present bill calls for the Librarian of Congress and the Archivist of the United States to sit on the board. It would make more sense, I think, to substitute the Head of the Motion Picture Section of the Library of Congress and the Head of the Audio-Visual Section of the National Archive, since they would have more direct information about the needs of the field.

One other aspect of the proposed board concerns me and that is the appointment of twelve members elected by the present board of the American Film Institute. Since the present board is so heavily weighed in favor of the interests of the commercial motion picture industry, it seems only fair to assume that they will elect similar persons to the new board. There is thus no way that one can hope that a number of important interest groups will have any say on the new board, notably film educators and independent film-makers. I would thus urge you to amend the bill so that these voices be heard on the new board. One way to do this would be to allow the Chairman of the National Endowment on the Arts, upon the advice of the Public Media Program of the Arts Endowment, to name at least five members of the board, or to recommend such names to the President of the United States in order that he could make such appointments.

The other amendment I would suggest has to do with the grant-making powers of the Institute. As Miss Hanks so well pointed out in her testimony, it would be a mistake to create a new Institute which both receives and gives out funds. In a time of financial stress, the Institute is likely to cut its grant-making activities in order to meet its own operating expenses. Thus, to give an example, funds that might go to the Museum of Modern Art to preserve some of its precious archive materials would be used instead for basic support of the Institute. Such a situation would be most detrimental to the Museum's preservation program and to the field in general. One can imagine numerous other examples of conflict which arise when an organization has to choose between its own basic support and the grants it gives to others. I would urge you to strike those portions of the bill which would allow the American Film Institute to give grants for film preservation and

awards for film makers. These programs ought to be continued, of course, but in a manner resembling the present system whereby the services are rendered via a contract with the National Endowment on the Arts.

Thank you for considering these requests.

Respectfully,

TED PERRY,

Professor and Chairman, Department of Cinema Studies, New York University.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Mallery.

Mr. MALLERY. I am David Mallery, director of studies of the National Association of Independent Schools. I have been on the board of trustees of the American Film Institute, except for an interval, since before it was officially given its name and launched.

I am a teacher but I have not felt like the token teacher on the board surrounded by captains of industry or film artists. Actually, one of the most extraordinary aspects of the thing, the experience, it seems to me, is that we have been more simply spokesmen for our constituencies in this venture.

I have submitted a statement and I think maybe with the time pressure, I better not read it because you would probably like to get to questions. I would like to say I am high on the American Institute, I am strongly supportive of this legislation. I have been part of our appreciation when something has gone well, when we felt we really have moved into some area that we cared about. I have been part of the agony when it turned out we couldn't do everything and we had to cut down hard and had to focus hard.

I feel very strongly about the importance of a national place where film is paid attention to in some kind of formal kind of way as an art and as a force in the lives of people in our Nation and beyond, and this is not to ignore the schools and colleges and museums and community art programs.

I think one of the reasons we have some of the tensions and some of the agonizing—the kind of things that have been described here—is that as a nation we care terribly about film. We are passionate about it and, if we are not consulted, if we know that we have a key piece of vision in this and we are not where the action is, so to speak, it is enormously frustrating. It is also frustrating to be where the action is if you find you can't do all that you want to do.

I think maybe a couple of quick samples from somebody outside the film industry, who is working professionally with kids, teachers, parents, and school board people around the country in the reconstruction archive business—last week I met with a group of about 30 students, teachers, and parents. We watched "The Power and the Glory," a 1933 film with Spencer Tracy, which was supposedly lost and has been reconstructed through the efforts of AFI and made available to us, not just tucked off in some kind of corner where we knew it existed, but we could have it because copyright arrangements were possible.

This is true of a whole range of other films and you have information on that. But, the fact we could look at that film, discuss it, we could watch the kind of experience, the kind of human experience spun out on that film, not as a curiosity from 1933 but as a human experience we could pay attention to and in the same week, I did the same thing with a larger group. I was watching John Hancock's film, "Bang the

Drum Slowly" which came out last week. The age ranged from about 11 years old to about 70 in that room. I think the important thing is that we don't lock young people in one corner and senior citizens in another and middle-aged people in another corner.

I think one of the marvelous things is that it does join us that way. As we watched that and talked of what it did to us, what it said to us about life and death and friendship and cruelty and awareness of something better than just taking life for granted, I had a strong sense, as I have had so often, of the AFI's ongoing part in something that is beyond education institutions, beyond film, beyond the film business, beyond even the idea of training people either to teach or to make, but into some kind of national bloodstream, which film is.

I would speak eagerly for building something which we don't have yet but which we are on our way to, a national center where outreach is possible, where coming together is possible and where films can help us be more human, more alive to our own lives and to the lives of the fellow across from us.

[The prepared statement of David Mallery follows:]

STATEMENT OF DAVID MALLERY, DIRECTOR OF STUDIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

My work is with students, teachers, administrators, parents and schoolboard people around the country. I see these people in schools, public meetings, in planned and random conversations, and in special gatherings I'm responsible for which bring people together to share problems, concerns, hopes, strategies to "do school" better more humanly. I am not connected with film making or the film business. Yet in a way I *am* connected with it, in many of the ways all of you—of us—in this room are, because film is such a powerful part of our lives, and of the lives of our children.

I am as aware as the next fellow of the amount of junk around in books, magazines, on TV and movie screens. I'm also aware of the power, the incalculable influence on what's best and most human in us all, of the *good* stuff in books and on film, and anyone working with kids has a unique chance to see how magically film can work, does work.

I have been working for and hanging with the American Film Institute since before it got a letterhead and headquarters and a director and an official board. Except for a stretch when I was off the board, I have been part of its hopes and struggles, its determination to Do Everything in film preservation, filmmaker training, film education, film scholarship, and in its joy in the moments when we could feel we'd broken through and really made a contribution, and in our frustration when we couldn't Do Everything and had to cut down and focus hard.

I am very high on the American Film Institute because it is the place—an actual place, here in Washington and in Los Angeles—where film is paid attention to in a formal, national way, as an art, as a force in the lives of people in and beyond our nation. This is not to ignore the schools and colleges and museums and community arts programs and centers of real interest and caring that are eagerly studying films, making them, training people to make them and appreciate them and recognize and extend quality instead of slog along with second or tenth rate stuff.

But to have a *national* group that says, in effect "Film is a part of the national bloodstream, with potential for nourishment of the human spirit, of bringing together separated individuals, of sharing experience, ideas and feelings and adventures, of lighting and shaping and pointing up experience."

We in this national organization are dedicated to that nourishment, are knocking ourselves out for it, in fact. One way is in finding young film makers of many different kinds of talent and caring and giving them some kind of help, sometimes a grant, sometimes moral support, sometimes actual training, sometimes one or more open doors to earning a place in film. Another is in seeking out

classic films crumbling somewhere and known only by legend or in old columns. We're getting news that seems like some kind of wonderful discovery—the 1921 OLIVER TWIST with Jackie Coogan and Lon Chaney that AFI found in an archive in Yugoslavia and reconstructed. We'll soon be able to see it or the John Ford film found with Czechoslovakian subtitles, a film supposedly lost, like his very first film, STRAIGHT SHOOTING, 1917, found, reconstructed, ready to flow into that national bloodstream of film, because of AFI, or Spencer Tracy's strange and haunting performance in THE POWER AND THE GLORY, a 1933 film supposedly lost and which I watched last week and searched out with a group of kids and teachers really eager to pursue the feelings, motives, impressions in that strange, enigmatic fellow man Tracy played so beautifully.

So many of these—part of AFI's role in making our past—not just film's past but our nation's and our world's past—alive again to us in ways that matter in the 1970's. And within a few days of that experience I had with the 1933 THE POWER AND THE GLORY, I sat with another audience of kids and adults, ranging from about 10 to 75. (I like that combination. I worry about the split between the young at their movies, their activities, their isolated world, and the world of the rest of us so supposedly cut off.)

We watched John Hancock's BANG THE DRUM SLOWLY and talked about it afterwards, really opened ourselves to the film and to each other. I have met John once, long after he made the film, but through AFI I feel connected with him, as he came into film through AFI and the Center for Advanced Film Studies. And as this group explored that film, as I saw how it stirred us to look at our own lives, to wonder how the experience of those baseball players in that marvelous movie related to our own appreciation of life, our own fears of death, our hesitancy to express feeling and our eagerness for friendship, our quickness to cut people down and our anger when it happens to us—the kind of experience we had with that film was unique—a sample of the magic of film working in "education" in the richest, most human sense.

Even from the middle of that experience I was grateful for AFI and the struggle to get that kind of talent and wider range of vision from past and present onto movie screens for all of us—in and beyond schools—films which can help us be more human, more alive to our own lives and to the lives of the fellow across from us and on beyond him or her and across the earth.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Nye.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am not sure of all it means to be absolutely last. One thing it must mean is that you have to be very brief.

I am Russell Nye, on the faculty of Michigan University. I don't have a direct connection with film, my field is American history, and film to me and others like me is a resource which is just beginning to be used in more sophisticated ways than ever before and the AFI is an agency that seems to have great potential for us and that is why many of us in the academic community are concerned with film and its progress.

I think film should be studied professionally as part of American social and cultural history. We feel that the American Film Institute has been of great assistance to teachers everywhere in helping to place film study on a firm and scholarly basis, and any legislation that will increase its effectiveness we obviously favor.

[The statement of Russell B. Nye follows.]

STATEMENT OF RUSSELL B. NYE BEFORE THE HOUSE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, JOHN BRADEMAS, CHAIRMAN

My name is Russell B. Nye. I am Distinguished Professor of English at Michigan State University, past President of the American Studies Association, past President of the Popular Culture Association, former Chairman of the Joint Committee of the Canadian Historical Association and the American Historical Association, and hold a Pulitzer Prize for American Biography. These activities

added to thirty three years of teaching American history and American literature may serve as testimony to a lifelong concern with the study of American Culture in which film plays such a significant role.

The American Film Institute has three general purposes: first, to collect, preserve, and catalogue films; second, to encourage the development of the art and to train future filmmakers; and third, to encourage and assist the study and teaching of film. Of these three functions—archival, professional, and educational—my major concern here is with the last. I hope to represent, insofar as one person can, the interest of the academic community in the legislation under consideration.

It became clear to teachers at every level, over a decade ago, that film was an important factor in everyone's life; that it had been for at least seventy-five years; and that something ought to be done about teaching it. Many people in academic life were aware of this, albeit dimly at first, and when the statistics began to appear we were surprised at how right we were. The latest reports show that by the time the average American is 18, he will have logged 17,000 hours of viewing time, and that he will have seen twenty movies for every book he has read—eventually, he will spend ten years of his life viewing *something*, a lot of which will be film.[1]

Film, then, we recognized as an integral part of everyone's environment and as the great popular literature of our time; literacy in film, we concluded, was an absolute imperative for anyone hoping to cope with the twentieth century. As a result, the more alert educational institutions and professional associations began to acknowledge that the study of film was a necessary component of modern education. The American Historical Association, for example, in 1970 created a Historian's Film Committee; the American Studies Association instituted a film section, and so did the Popular Culture Association, which at its last convention in Milwaukee presented twenty scholarly papers on film and had continuous showings of films fifteen hours a day for the delegates. Prior to that, however, about thirty colleges and universities had already established departments of film study, and by now there are 80,000 students each year enrolled in 3,000 film courses. I don't have national figures, but in Michigan there are film courses in over a hundred high schools as part of the regular curriculum.

This is why, then, many of us in the academic community are deeply concerned with the American Film Institute and its progress. We feel that film should be studied, seriously and professionally, as part of American social and cultural history, and as a form of creative expression fully as valid as poetry, drama, fiction, painting, or any other art form. The American Film Institute has been of great assistance to teachers everywhere in helping to place film study on a firm, scholarly basis, and any legislation that will increase its effectiveness we obviously favor. My own field is cultural history, and I long ago found that the study of the "movies," as my generation will always know them, provides us with invaluable insights into the American past, for they show us what people were *moved* by, which shows us what they thought and felt at a particular time and in a particular context. The most difficult things for any historian to reconstruct are people's fears and hopes, their illusions and realities, their dreams and values—and while we never can *really* find these out for sure, the films that people respond to embody this kind of past more than many other kinds of evidence.

My point is, then, that since film has helped to shape us all, we must study and understand it in every way we can, if we are to understand our past and our present. The American Film Institute is an important factor in helping us do this.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Had you finished, Mr. Nye?

Mr. NYE. Yes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Nye.

I thank all of you.

I might just observe as I listen to this diversity of views here, my mind goes back to college days, and my reading Plato's "Republic" in which Plato made very clear that one group of human beings he did not want in his city or state was the artists because they were trouble-

[1] John Harrington, *The Rhetoric of Film* (New York, 1973).

makers. They were, he said, always arguing and fighting with each other and generally making life miserable for the philosophers who were supposed to be running the place. I guess things have not changed very much since those days.

I do think that I would just like to make one or two general observations. I quite appreciate the concern that some of our witnesses have had about the matter of adequate consultation. This is a comment that we have heard on nearly every bill that comes before this committee on which I have sat for 16 years. Everybody thinks that he is representative. Some of us go out and get elected and therefore try to have some warrant of legitimacy so I would only confess the attitude on the part of the committee is that we do our best to try to make sure many kinds of views are heard.

Second, I would hope that at least one advantage of the bill that has been introduced which would establish the AFI as an entity independent of the National Arts Endowment would be that the AFI would, in fact, be directly accountable to Congress and that it, therefore, might be somewhat easier for criticisms to be effectively voiced of the operations of the AFI.

As it is now with the American Film Institute so heavily dependent on the National Arts Endowment, it may not be quite as easy for us in Congress to learn of both criticisms and praise and suggestions coming through the Arts Endowment.

I also sense, after having heard the testimony for the last 2 days, that perhaps we need to get a clearer picture of the public media program of the Arts Endowment than we may presently have. Do any of you sit on the panels of the public media program panel?

You do, sir—Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Emshwiller—I think I am a sensitive enough politician not to let go unnoticed that criticisms of the operation of AFI have been voiced by people who have served on the Public media panels of the National Arts Endowment. That is not illegal or immoral but it is understandable and I think I view the public media program and the AFI as part of one another, as it were, parts of a similar fabric and I understand there can be tensions and pulls as we have observed here.

So, I only offer these as reactions of my own to some of the comments I have heard here today, to indicate that I remain as chairman of the subcommittee—and as one who has some legislative responsibility for the National Arts Endowment as well as for the AFI—committed to the proposition that we need both a strong National Arts Endowment and a strong public media program in the Arts Endowment as well as a strong film institute.

I am hopeful we will have both.

Let me say that the hearings we have had and any subsequent hearings we may have, and any legislation we may find it possible to write, will be such that it will strengthen the kinds of activities that I think all of our witnesses have indicated they favor. Now, that may sound like a Pollyannish hope on my part. I don't mean it in that tone, but I do think there is a danger that if allies start shooting at each other, they will end up in civil war which, as the fellow said, are always the bloodiest.

So, I hope we can work out something here that will be conducive to a strengthened AFI and a strong public media program in the National Arts Endowment.

I will invite any of our panelists now to make any comments they wish to make on what I have said or any further comments you wish to make at this time, before we adjourn.

Yes, Mr. Perry.

Mr. Perry. I would like to say in response to your first statement, which was—and I certainly understand it, Mr. Chairman—and many pieces of legislation come before this committee which are created by this committee, and hearings are held and so on and my impression—this may be wrong—is when the information reaches some of us in the film community that a certain group of people had already been contacted to come and speak for the bill. Many of those you heard from.

My feeling is if one can get information to people who are for the people, one should make some attempt to contact those people who might represent other groups.

Mr. Brademas. I think if you look at the witnesses who testified, you will find there have been criticisms both of the bill and the AFI. We have been in touch with the National Arts Endowment for months and months on the whole AFI problem to which this bill is an effort to come up with some answers.

Yes, Mr. O'Grady.

Mr. O'Grady. Though I happen to be a new member of the Endowments for the Art panel and recently attended my first meeting, I would'a't want you to think my familiarity with the American Film Institute is the result of that involvement or, as I would see it, as a sign of warfare or put it in a context of the American Film Institute or the National Endowments for the Arts. It might be quite possible that someone as an educator, someone operating in this field, as many of us are, that we might be quite critical of both organizations.

Mr. Brademas. I appreciate that.

Mr. Mallery.

Mr. Mallery. I am grateful for your comments about the civil war and my experience tells me this is more than wishful thinking about the AFI, that we are working toward coming together about film, which does not depend on warring factions.

At one meeting I attended, people talked about creative people as opposed to presumably uncreative people. That didn't go over very well. Presumably, Shirley McLaine was creative or that a noncommercial film was uncreative.

With the panel here, we don't make the assumption, nor do you, Mr. Chairman, that the person whose film goes into the regular theater is some kind of hack who sold his soul or that there is a purity of soul for the person that didn't get into that.

The same goes the other way, that we deify the commercial person and put down the creative person.

This could be a great step forward in bringing us together and not in hogging the market for caring about film but in bringing us together to help each other and serve our Nation through film.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you.

Any other comments?

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

The subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:28 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

The following memorandum discusses that section of H.R. 17021 (Section 103) called "Powers and Duties of the Board." Its purpose is to make more explicit the authorities provided in that Section. In most instances, these authorities are presently being exercised by the AFI; in others, they flow naturally from the present activities of AFI. Given the nature of this art form and of AFI's broad mandate to support and encourage it, the memorandum will not attempt to specify every program that AFI might undertake in the future. But it is intended to spell out with as much exactitude as possible the generic types of activities which are appropriate for AFI.

In general, the thrust of AFI's activities is as an operating and service oriented organization with national responsibilities. Insofar as it is necessary for the AFI to make grants to fulfill its functions, it will do so under the authority of this Act, particularly in its long-standing programs of archival preservation and grants to independent filmmakers. AFI recognizes that the thrust of the National Endowment for the Arts is to give assistance as a grant-making agency and AFI does not intend to duplicate the function of NEA's Public Media Program.

(1) Provide for the publication of historical records and of commentaries on the art of film, and disseminate such materials

One of AFI's original purposes was to conduct and sponsor research into the history of film. From such research, which includes oral history, AFI produces a range of publications providing information on the history as well as the art and craft of filmmaking. For example: The American Film Institute Catalog is a research project to assemble complete data on all motion pictures made in the United States. The first volume, "Feature Films, 1921–1930" has been published and contains data on over 6,600 films. Other volumes are being completed. When finished, the Catalog will provide a compendium of information on American films and will be invaluable for film scholars and historians.

A monthly publication, "Dialogue on Film," contains interviews with outstanding filmmakers. AFI, given sufficient funding, will resume publishing "AFI Report," a quarterly containing scholarly articles and information on film and television. A comprehensive directory of university film courses is published and a film and television annual to organize and circulate data useful to the profession will also be published. These and similar periodicals and books will be of considerable value to film schools and scholars, as well as to professional filmmakers, throughout the country. Certain of these publications will be disseminated through AFI's membership program which produces revenue and enlarges public involvement in AFI.

(2) Undertake and coordinate, through contract or otherwise, the preservation of films and film artifacts of artistic and historical value (including films and recordings made for television), and the production of films for charitable, patriotic, educational, or other public purposes

One of the reasons for the founding of AFI in 1967 was to establish a point of national collaboration for the preservation of film material of artistic and historical value. AFI coordinates a national preservation program in collaboration with the Library of Congress and other motion picture achives and libraries. The AFI collection itself contains over 10,000 films which have been preserved, including many that were in danger of deterioration and which are valued at more than $70,000,000. The Institute plans to coordinate a program for the preservation of television material.

AFI also acquires historical film artifacts which are in danger of destruction or loss.

The Film Institute has produced a major documentary on the great American filmmaker, John Ford, which is distributed through educational channels. It

is presently preparing under contract with the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration the production of a film portraying American history through the selected use of excerpts from Classic American motion pictures since the early 20th century. AFI has produced two television specials celebrating the careers of two Life Achievement award winners, John Ford and James Cagney. These programs were seen by millions of Americans and produced substantial revenues for the educational activities of AFI. AFI does not see itself as a motion picture studio, but on occasion it is able to produce films of educational value portraying aspects of American history and culture and where appropriate, it will do so.

(3) Maintain and operate a conservatory for advanced studies in the cinematic arts, cause materials developed at such conservatory to be made available for study in other institutions, and make grants to persons who demonstrate particular promise as filmmakers

AFI operates a conservatory for advanced film studies in California. This is a post-graduate institution offering training in directing, producing, writing and cinematography to exceptionally promising filmmakers. A number of graduates of AFI have already realized that promise. It is commonly regarded as one of the outstanding film academies in the world and has available to it the talent and knowledge of hundreds of the most accomplished professional filmmakers. This conservatory is vital to AFI's encouragement of the future of American film and television nationwide.

The national utility of the conservatory will be emphasized as AFI becomes increasingly able to provide publications, films and video tapes which extend the knowledge of film arts and crafts to students at universities and other institutions across the country.

The careers of some young filmmakers can best be advanced by training them as Fellows at the AFI conservatory. Other independent filmmakers are ready to make the films without further academic training, and AFI assists them through grants and the provision of advice and counsel. The Film Institute recognizes that NEA makes grants to filmmakers.

In fact, both AFI and NEA have purposes which can only be fully served by making grants to talented persons who cannot support their art through conventional commercial channels. Because of the nature of the film art and the wide variety of forms which it takes, it would be unwise to insist on a hard line of demarcation between the authorities of AFI and NEA to make independent filmmaker grants.

(4) Provide programming assistance to exhibitors throughout the Nation in order to increase the accessibility of such films to the American public

One of AFI's functions is to increase the enjoyment and appreciation of the film arts. Its film theater in the Kennedy Center functions as a national gallery of film, it serves as a model and proving ground and it will respond to requests for advice and technical assistance from other film programming entities across the country. AFI will coordinate a national information service, offering information such as sources of films, program notes and other data. It will collaborate with local institutions and help make touring programs of films available. In this way AFI will use its special expertise and experience to aid film programming across the country.

AFI recognizes that NEA makes cash grants to such local film programming organizations and does not intend to duplicate that function.

(5) Provide for the appropriate recognition of extraordinary contributions to the art of film

In keeping with its charter which calls for AFI's providing appropriate recognition to film artists who have contributed to American culture, AFI presents an annual award for Life Achievement. AFI may create other awards when in the judgment of its Trustees it is felt such awards will advance the art of film and television.

(6) Advise and assist educational institutions and other organizations as to methods of teaching and research, including workshops, conferences, seminars, and publications, relating to the art of motion pictures and television

In keeping with its function to disseminate knowledge about film and television, AFI conducts workshops, seminars and conferences which will bring together leaders in the field to share knowledge and learn. When appropriate

AFI will publish the results of those activities. AFI's thrust in this area is to organize, operate or advise such programs, whereas NEA, using its grant making capability, supports such programs.

(17) Solicit, accept, and dispose of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, securities, and other properties of whatsoever character for the benefit of the Institute, including contributions derived from National Film Day theater ticket sales and American Film Institute Lifetime Achievement Award celebrations.

Self-explanatory. The National Film Day and the Life Achievement Award celebrations are substantial fundraisers for AFI and both have contributed to a wider popular appreciation of the art of film. The Fans of AFI and the Council of 100 are newer projects which provide financial support and citizen involvement for AFI.

(18) obtain grants from, and make contracts with, State, Federal, local, and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals;"

Assuming the passage of this legislation, AFI would expect to continue to serve as an operating entity eligible for contracts with, and grants from, other agencies, public and private.

(19) Acquire, hold, maintain, use, operate, and dispose of any physical facilities, including equipment, necessary for the administration and operation of the Institute.

Self-explanatory.

(19) Appoint and fix the compensation of a director and such other officers and employees of the Institute as may be necessary for its efficient operation. The director and such other officers and employees shall be well qualified by experience and training in films or television to perform the duties of their office.

Self-explanatory.

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS PUBLIC MEDIA PROGRAM

This memorandum concerns the Public Media Program of the National Endowment for the Arts. First a word about the legislative history, the Endowment's goals, and the importance of an integrated, unified approach to encouraging cultural activities in this country. The National Endowment for the Arts, under its enabling legislation, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, has broad responsibility to assist all of the various art fields throughout the Nation, including motion pictures, television, radio, tape and sound recording. (The other fields include: music, dance, drama, folk art, creative writing, architecture and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, industrial design, costume and fashion design, the arts related to the presentation, performance, execution, and exhibition of such arts, and the study and application of the arts to the human environment.)

In interpreting its legislated responsibilities, the National Council on the Arts has guided the Endowment's programs to achieve three basic goals:

GOAL I: AVAILABILITY OF THE ARTS

To promote broad dissemination of cultural resources of the highest quality across the country.

GOAL II: CULTURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

To assist our major cultural institutions to improve artistic and administrative standards and to provide greater public service.

GOAL III: ADVANCEMENT OF OUR CULTURAL LEGACY

To support creativity among our most gifted artists, encourage the preservation of our cultural heritage, and advance the quality of life of our nation.

The Public Media Program of the Endowment serves these three goals through grant making and contracting in the variety of areas described below.

The Endowment's enabling legislation places policy and program guidance in the hands of the National Council on the Arts, providing that a group of independent professionals will advise on the shape and substance of policy and pro-

grams necessary to meet the changing needs of its constituency. While the Endowment's current program categories are structured to meet current needs, the Endowment anticipates that as needs and opportunities in all the arts fields continue to evolve, its programs in all fields will likewise continue to evolve.

PUBLIC MEDIA PROGRAM—1974–75 AND OTHER ENDOWMENT ACTIVITIES IN FILM, TELEVISION, VIDEO, RADIO

All Endowment programs (there are currently 12) are designed to be responsive to specific disciplines *and* to the overall goals of the Endowment. The programs are intended to be flexible in order to meet rapidly changing trends, and in particular to react to inter-related, inter-disciplinary opportunities. As in most areas served by the Endowment, the Public Media Program aids individuals and institutions; it covers the fields of film, television, video, and radio. Following is a brief description of the present categories of assistance.

To promote broad dissemination of cultural resources of the highest quality across the country.

A. PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS

Film, television, video and radio are an important focus for the Endowment, not only as art forms in themselves, but also as communicators of the arts to all our citizens. Touring of arts groups is an integral part of the Endowment's programming to make the arts more accessible to more people. Yet, despite touring, there are millions of Americans who might never be reached by live performances. Therefore, in addition to programs of creative development, the Public Media Program works cooperatively with the other Endowment programs to make the arts more accessible.

Examples of projects that have received matching grant support in the past include BOLERO, a 30 minute film about the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra which won an Academy Award; AMERICAN BALLET THEATRE: A CLOSEUP IN TIME, a 90 minute special featuring ART in performance; YOUNG FILMMAKERS FESTIVAL, a 60 minute compilation of award-winning animated and live-action films by children; VIDEO: THE NEW WAVE, a 60 minute program surveying the work of artists working with video; and ALVIN AILEY: MEMORIES AND VISIONS, a 60 minute presentation of highlights from the repertory of the Alley Company.

All of the productions listed above have been broadcast in prime time over the Public Television network.

In Fiscal 1974, the Endowment received some 125 proposals for programming in the arts totaling over $50,000,000. The Endowment was able to fund only 35 of the proposals.

Examples of projects presently in various stages of development follow:

There are films to be made by or under the aegis of state and regional arts agencies, each highlighting the special cultural heritage, activities and achievements of a particular state or region. Showing of these films on local television will be encouraged, and state arts agencies plan to put them to many other uses as well. In addition, the footage may be used in part in making a major national film on the arts in America.

A ten-program series on the independent film is being assembled, produced, and distributed nationally for cable television by the Cable Arts Foundation.

A major American Television Drama (KCET–TV) series that will be broadcast on the public television network is jointly funded with the Ford Foundation and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. A major series for Public Television on American dance is projected.

A major film, or films, for broadcast on national television, that will provide a panoramic picture of the arts in America today. This will include footage from a variety of existing films; the state arts agency films (described above); the films on American song and dance (discussed below); new footage covering "City Spirit" projects as they take shape, and other new material filmed on location in all parts of the country.

A 90 minute film on American song for television. A major television film in the field of dance is also being planned, complementary to the "Song" film.

B. Endowment-Corporation for Public Broadcasting Joint Program

This cooperative program (CPB matches Arts Endowment funds) serves the objectives of both organizations by fostering the arts on public broadcasting through symposiums, experimental arts workshops, and arts programming. Grants are recommended jointly by representatives of the Endowment's Public Media Panel and of CPB. The emphasis is in the area of workshops, seminars, and filmmaker in residence programs designed to encourage a wider utilization of the nation's artistic resources (by public broadcasting). In addition, actual arts programming is supported and widely disseminated via public television.

C. American Film Series for Television

Although both commercial and public television programming testifies to the large audience for feature films, neither has initiated a major tribute to the American feature film as an art form.

Through partnership with private funding sources, a matching grant was awarded to KVIE TV in Sacramento for a series called *The Immigrants* which will present the films of American directors who immigrated from other countries. Nine programs will include complete feature film classics, most never seen before on TV, made in America by directors such as Fritz Lang, F. W. Murnau, Victor Seastrom, Ernst Lubitsch, and Billy Wilder. Similar projects are planned. In addition to broadcast over the public television network, there will be educational distribution with supporting study materials.

D. Short Film Showcasing

In terms of availability, the short film is one of our most neglected art forms. Theatrical distribution of shorts is virtually non-existent which means that the majority of American audiences never have an opportunity to see a unique and important aspect of cinema.

With the cooperation of theatre owners and distributors, the Endowment is encouraging the exhibition of a limited number of outstanding short films by independent filmmakers in theatres throughout the country. The Endowment is contributing print costs, including blowups from 16mm to 35mm, and a fellowship to the filmmakers who are included in the program.

Films for the first year of this project have been selected. The National Association of Theatre Owners is cooperating and the films will be distributed by Twentieth Century Fox, United Artists, and Warner Brothers as shorts accompanying first-run feature films.

E. Other Endowment Film, Television and Radio Projects

Almost all programs of the Endowment have film and television projects as integral to their programming. Examples include many films on Artists-in-Schools, Expansion Arts touring, "Stations" (the film on preservation of railroad stations), design improvement films. There are other films for television like the one designed to show how cooperative effort among many interest groups and individuals can make the arts an integral part of the life of a community. This film will be made available in calendar year 1975 to state and local agencies, Bicentennial Commissions, cultural organizations, and a variety of community groups. Television broadcast will be encouraged. The film will be professionally produced under contract.

Goal II: Cultural Resources Development

To assist our major cultural institutions to improve artistic and administrative standards and to provide greater public service.

Regional Media Organizations

This program aims at encouraging the widest possible access to and participation in the art of film/radio/video throughout the country. The Endowment currently supports programs in about 25 of these regional centers; it is anticipated that there will be many more eligible for support in the next several years. They

are being established independently or as part of a museum or university to meet the tremendous demand for programs which 1) build new audiences through regional cinema showcases and video exhibition centers; 2) provide centrally-located media resource centers for research and study of the moving image; 3) provide information to encourage the development of creative film programming. Many universities and museums throughout the country offer classic and innovative media programming.

Goal III—Advancement of Our Cultural Legacy

To support creativity among our most gifted artists, encourage the preservation of our cultural heritage, and advance the quality of life of our nation.

A. The American Film Institute

As stated in a recent AFI document, "In general, the thrust of AFI's activities is to run operating and service oriented organization with national responsibilities." AFI works in the areas of film archives and preservation; film programming and exhibition; filmmaker training and filmmaker grants; education, research and publication.

The Endowment joined with the Ford Foundation and member companies of the motion picture industry to create the AFI in 1967 as a private non-profit corporation. Since its establishment, through grants and contracts, the Arts Endowment has supported preservation and filmmaker activities through the AFI. It has supported the AFI's general operations, with the exception of the AFI Theatre in the Kennedy Center, Washington, D.C.

Endowment supported AFI's activities include:

maintaining and operating a conservatory for filmmaker training in California, in connection with which the AFI makes grants to individual filmmakers;

coordinating with the Library of Congress and others in preservation programs and operating a cataloguing archival program;

providing annual awards for lifetime achievement in film.

The Endowment and the AFI attempt to coordinate their activities and in like manner also with a variety of other agencies, private and public, such as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Smithsonian, the National Archives, the Library of Congress, and the U.S. Office of Education.

B. Film Preservation

The only kind of film in use prior to 1951 was nitrate, a highly flammable, unstable substance. Transfer to acetate or other permanent stock is essential to preserve America's rich film heritage.

At the Endowment's request, the American Film Institute, the George Eastman House, the Library of Congress, and the Museum of Modern Art, prepared a study outlining the cost and magnitude of a major solution to the problem. Estimated total need is on the order of $80 million.

Annual federal funding in the film preservation area, not including administrative costs, is approximately $245,000 appropriated directly to the Library of Congress and an additional $261,000 in Endowment contract funds to the AFI. The AFI subgrants to the Museum of Modern Art, George Eastman House and the Library of Congress while retaining a portion of the funds for its own acquisition preservation efforts.

C. Preservation of Other Art Forms

The Endowment is funding projects utilizing film, video and radio for documenting purposes [illegible] in dance, [illegible] arts. The Public Media staff and panel reviewers on these proposals, [illegible] handled by offices in the appropriate disciplines.

D. Fellowships

1. *Independent Filmmaker Fellowships.*—At present, there are very few sources of funding for independent filmmakers. $261,000 has gone to AFI (contract) in Fiscal Years 1973, 1974 and 1975 for independent filmmaker grants. Previously, in Fiscal Year 1972 the AFI made 10 grants totalling $80,000. With Endowment support in Fiscal Year 1973, 28 grants were awarded at a maximum level of

$70,000. Approximately the same number was made in 1974 and is projected for 1975.

C. CATV Fellowships.—Although cable television has the ability to offer diverse programming suited to the interests of individual communities, little has been done to encourage talented young film and media professionals to develop the medium to its fullest potential. A program placing young filmmakers in residence at CATV stations has been helpful to young graduates seeking practical experience in the field and can be considered an extension of their training.

This program is administered by New York University. To date, nine filmmakers have been selected and matched with 9 CATV stations around the country. The participating stations are located in: Bloomington, Indiana; Buffalo, New York; Concord, New Hampshire; Dubuque, New York; Fort Lee, New Jersey; Johnson City, Tennessee; Madison, Wisconsin; and Stockton, California.

D. Post Graduate Fellowships.—The Endowment, in a pilot program with six universities, is giving selected students the opportunity to gain production experience necessary to their professional careers. The program is a three-way partnership between a host university, a local public broadcast station and a filmmaker. The first stage of this program provided grants of $11,000 each to six universities that provide professional training in film and/or television. The fellowships are for a maximum of nine months and include a living stipend of $800 a month as well as overall production budget of $7,500. The universities donate all equipment and supervision needed for the project. The program gives the young filmmaker the experience of bringing together the resources of a university and a local public television station to create a new work for broadcast while working within stipulated time and budget limitations.

E. Other Fellowships.—Fellowships are given to filmmakers participating in the short film showcasing program described above. Further, some of the other Endowment fellowship programs directly involve film, television, video or radio (or example those in visual arts, composition, dance) and those Endowment offices call on the expertise of the Public Media Panel and Staff.

F. Media Studies.—This program is designed to improve standards of study of film and video art by offering support to educational institutions to develop information for film and video study, and to sponsor workshops, seminars, and summer institutes designed to bring teachers working in film and video together with professional filmmakers and video artists. In FY 1974, grants assisted more than 30 organizations around the United States in the development of film and video studies.

F. Research and Development/General Programs.—The National Council has stressed repeatedly the need for "general program" funds in *all* areas of Endowment programming. Are these funds clearly are critical in a field as complex (both artistically and technically) and as rapidly changing as the media. They permit funding flexibility for projects which do not fall into other categories because of their experimental nature, or because they represent a totally new emerging area. Examples of projects funded to date include partial support of a workship to experiment with choreographers and television. Other areas include research fellowships and assistance to improve the art of film criticism.

[Telegram]

October 6, 1974.

CHAIRMAN
House Select Subcommittee on Education,
Cayhoga House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Screen Actors Guild, a union of 28,000 actors has watched with great interest the growth and development of the American Film Institute as an important national film institution. During the past 2 years the Guild and the AFI have created a joint training program which has proved beneficial and effective. We recognize the importance of the American Film Institute to the art of film and television in the United States. We commend the committee's action in undertaking to make it a permanent institution with dependable funding.

DENNIS WEAVER,
President.
KATHLEEN NOLAN,
First Vice President, Screen Actors Guild.

THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT,
Burlington, Vt., October 17, 1974.

CHAIRMAN,
The Brademas Subcommittee on Select Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I wish to state my objections to the proposed bill H.R. 17021 which is intended to have Congress fund two-thirds of the budget for the American Film Institute.

I am not against the concept of a National Film Institute. Not only is one needed, but long overdue. I am against the present organization being taken out of the public domain. My reasons are many, but for brevity's sake, let me state just two.

First, it is important that you realize that I was one of a select group from across the country brought together at Waltham, Massachusetts in 1967 to discuss and to advise the founders as to the possible priorities that the AFI might establish in terms of film education. Since then, the direction of the AFI has taken so many twists and turns that one can question its real value to film educators at all. Each year has brought new promises and new resignations, not only in terms of key personnel, but also in budding scholarly programs. The most recent setback to serious film study has been Dean Frank Daniel's departure from the AFI's Center for Advanced Film Studies. The fact that so many other important and influential film people have felt the need to withdraw from the AFI strongly suggests that a complete and impartial review of the organization and its priorities is in order. Until such time, and assuming that the AFI can be supported by film scholars, it seems unwise to provide it with subsidized funds which will make the present body more isolated and secure.

Second, the idea that the present organization would have the major decisions as to which programs, groups, or individuals will receive federal funds for film programs is frightening. In those areas such as film preservation and records (where AFI has distinguished itself), the interests of AFI clearly conflict with other professional bodies; i.e., The Museum of Modern Art and The Eastman House. Given the choice between funding themselves or competing groups, and knowing the AFI's past performance, the present AFI certainly does not breed confidence in its ability to be objective. What's more, no such conflict of interests should be considered. Schools, societies, and research groups should have as much right to federal funds as the AFI. Nowhere has it indicated that the AFI is a national organization. It is just one more private interest group in search of support.

I do not intend by this letter to hurt the AFI. Someday it may well become the national organization we need and deserve. At such time, I will gladly support a bill such as H.R. 17021.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK MANCHEL,
Professor of Communication.

[Mailgram]

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Relative to pending legislation for support of the American Film Institute I wish to attest to the importance of this national commitment to American film art I have recently returned from a meeting of the International Congress of Schools of Cinema and Television (CILECT) held in Tokyo where representatives from 26 nations, most of them national film-TV schools of institutes met to discuss the training of image makers of the future. The value of a national institute in addition to the representation of U.S. colleges, and universities with Films TV programs cannot be over estimated. We are behind other major nations in this respect. The American film, with theatrical and non-theatrical, is one of our most important national resources and perhaps most effective cultural assets abroad. A well organized, well funded American Film Institute could service the total U.S. film-television community, improve the state of film literacy in this country, provide resources for advanced film study and film making, encourage scholarship in the field, serve as a national show-

cause for images which reflect both the art of film and the American way of life, and help improve our representation in the academic community at home and abroad.

I trust that the committee will seriously consider the essential role which an American film institute can have in this country and regret that prior commitments make it impossible for me to appear before the committee in person at the time of the hearings on this matter.

ROBERT W. WAGNER,
Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, the Ohio State University.

[Mailgram]

BERKELEY, CALIF.

CHAIRMAN BRADEMAS,
Select Education Subcommittee
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

RE: HR 17021

Please delay action on bill until all views can be heard. It is not serving film or filmmakers to have AFI control funds.

VICTOR ROSENBERG,
Assistant Professor, School of Librarianship, University of California.

[Mailgram]

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

CHAIRMAN BRADEMAS,
The Select Education Subcommittee, The Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding H.R. 17021 I urge you not to recommend that AFI be made sole recipient of film funds. Such action would be disastrous to broad base media education and community programs. AFI record in these areas has been marked by insensitivity and incompetence. I will gladly testify about many programs deserving support which, while lacking Hollywood glitter serve people.

JON R. DUNN,
Director, Communication Experience,
Director, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

[Mailgram]

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The Indianapolis Museum of Art urges you to support bill H.R. 17021 for ongoing funding of the American Film Institute. This museum has received programs, consultant services, etc., as well as AFI support in establishing a regional film center for Indiana at the Indianapolis Museum of Art. Your positive consideration for the passing of this bill will be greatly appreciated.

PEGGY LOAR,
Curator of Education, Indianapolis Museum of Art.

[Telegram]

VALENCIA, CALIF., *October 19, 1971.*

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: As the dean of the school of film at California Institute of the Arts I heartily support bill number H.R. 17021. It would assure the stability and continuity of the American Film Institute, an institution which has brought the art of film, a native American art, a high state of recognition in its technical work, its research work and through its educational program.

ALEXANDER MACKENDRICK,
Dean, School of Film, California Institute of the Arts.

[Mailgram]

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Chairman BRADEMAS,
Select Education Subcommittee,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urge House Committee not to amend NEA and NEH mandate to allow AFI to control film subsidies (legislation H.R. 17021).

KAREN COOPER,
Film Forum.

[Telegram]

OCTOBER 8, 1974

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS and RONALD SARASIN,
Committee on Education and Labor,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

As an historian who has used the AFI catalog and as a teacher who has worked with AFI educational services I urge your support of H.R. 17021.

BERNARD MERGEN,
Bicentennial Office, Smithsonian Institution Washington, D.C.

[Mailgram]

Congressman BRADEMAS,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly oppose setting AFI up as sole recipient of congressional funds for film as in H.R. 17021. They have a disastrous track record in the film education field. Please hold further public hearings, very few of us trust AFI or its structure or leadership.

RONALD E. SUTTON,
Assistant Professor, Department of Communication, American University, Washington, D.C.

[Mailgram]

OCTOBER 9, 1974

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to support House Resolution 17021 the work of the AFI is of real importance.

RUTH WEISBERG,
Acting Associate Dean, School of Architecture and Fine Arts, University of Southern California.

[Mailgram]

CONCORD, CALIF., *October 9, 1974.*

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly oppose transferring film production funds from NEA to AFI. Public interest demands speding hearings on H.R. 97121.

CLAIR CALHOON,
President, Association for Media Education.

[Mailgram]

OCTOBER 9, 1974.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Reference H.R. 17021. I support American Film Institute. They perform an unparalleled service to the preservation and development of the art of film, especially as it relates to the American cinema. Organization as a nonprofit agency is recommended. Hopefully Federal support bill follow.

WILLIAM HETZER,
New York State Education Department.

[Telegram]

NEW YORK, N.Y.

CHAIRMAN,
House Education subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

I urge you to delay action on H.R. 17021 until more information is available.

TERRY KEMPER,
Whitney Museum.

HOWARD SUBER, PH. D.,
Canoga Park, Calif., October 19, 1974.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: House Resolution 17021 has just come to my attention today. I wish I and several of my colleagues on the West Coast had known about this resolution earlier, so we could have requested time to appear on this matter, about which there will surely be strong sentiment in the field.

I am Chairman of the Board of Trustees of The Film and Television Study Center, Inc., a non-profit consortium of the major film and television institutions in Southern California. I am a Director of both the University Film Association and the Society for Cinema Studies, the two professional organizations in the field. I am also Director of the UCLA Film Archive and a professor at U.C.L.A. In these various capacities, I have come into contact with a wide variety of people and have discussed the American Film Institute often. I think my opinions would be found to be those of a majority of my colleagues in each of these organizations.

The American Film Institute has been consistently successful in only one area: public relations. The energies and talents of its director and his key aids are admirably suited to function in this respect. However, it is common experience that the more one knows about what is *really* going on at the AFI, the less one supports it.

The AFI has, in a few years, managed to mishandle several million dollars in such a manner that it has alienated several foundations, the overwhelming majority of professional film educators, and a majority of its own employees, who have left it in anger or despair in the past few years. Indeed, a simple examination of the turnover of personnel at the AFI would suggest in itself the gross incompetence with which the institution has been run.

Having alienated both the benefactors who originally were intended to fund the Institute and the constituency it was intended to serve, it is incredible that Congress should now seriously be considering bailing the AFI out of a mess of its own making. What the field itself will no longer support, Congress is asked to take over.

Where is the constituency for the American Film Institute, Congressman Brademas? If your committee does its research properly, I suggest you will find that it no longer has one, aside from a handful of trustees who were hand-picked by the AFI director himself, or a few well-known film figures who have not observed AFI operations closely.

There are far many more, like myself, who initially supported the AFI and tried to help it achieve its announced goals, but who have totally lost faith in it as, one by one, it has compromised, perverted, or lied about what it stood for until now it is not only virtually bankrupt financially, but morally as well.

I strenuously oppose H.R. 17021 for two reasons:

1. The American Film Institute does not deserve to be singled out as the one private institution in line to receive direct federal aid—there are other institutions far more meritorious of receiving such support should it ever be forthcoming. Congress doesn't bail out mismanaged airlines—why should it bail out mismanaged film organizations with no mandate other than those generated by their public relations people?

2. No agency in the private sector should become the conduit for dispersal of federal money by way of grants to the film field. The National Endowment for the Arts has done an admirable job with very limited resources. Any Congressional funding to the field of film should go through an agency such as NEA, which is under direct Congressional supervision.

In closing, let me assure you I do not oppose all federal aid to the film field. Film is the major art form of the 20th Century, and America's importance to it cannot be overestimated. It is sad how little our government has cared about this art form, and as a consequence how its past classics have been allowed to dis-

appear and its present production allowed to diminish. Film can indeed use proper aid from the government. But not to—or through—an institution as discredited as the American Film Institute.

If you wish concrete evidence to support the above claims, I and a large number of my colleagues across the country will be more than happy to furnish it.

Sincerely,

HOWARD SUBER.

WASHINGTON EDUCATIONAL
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION,
Arlington, Va., October 16, 1974.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, House Select Subcommittee on Education, Rayburn House Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: This letter is to indicate my support for passage of H.R. 17021 concerning the establishment of the American Film Institute as a non-profit corporation eligible for Federal Funding.

Sincerely yours,

RAY GLADFELTER,
Director of National ITV Development, WETA–TV, Washington, D.C.

[Telegram]

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Select Education Subcommittee,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

Pursuant to H.R. 17021:

As a former member of the American Film Institutes educations department and as someone presently evolved in teaching film making to educators on all levels. I strongly urge your committee not to designate the AFI as the official governmental agency charged with sustaining the advancement of motion pictures in this country. At the very least, please delay your decision pending further investigation.

Sincerely,

KIT LAYBOURNE.

[Mailgram]

Brooklyn, N.Y., October 12, 1974.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS
Film, Brooklyn College,
Washington, D.C.

I write to you in support of resolution number H.R. 17021, the American Film Institute has done important and helpful work in film preservation and the development of film talent and should definitely continue to exist.

PAUL RONDER,
Grantee of the AFI's Independent Film Program, Assistant Professor of Brooklyn College.

FILM QUARTERLY,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS,
Berkeley, Calif., October 8, 1974.

SELECT EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: You may be interested in the enclosed article which resulted from our scrutiny of the American Film Institute several years ago.

I believe you will find that, among the scholarly film community concerned with archival and other matters, criticism of the AFI's management has not diminished in the interim.

It would seem wise, therefore, to limit direct congerssional funding of AFI programs strictly to the archival activities in which its record is excellent. The

remainder of AFI programs, both in the East and at Greystone, appear to be in their usual chaotic state, and funding of them should certainly be carried out under very carefully established and regularly enforced guidelines.

In short, action on HR 17021 should not be taken until a full range of views has been secured from the film community in which AFI exists and operates. This must include more than Hollywood industry luminaries.

Sincerely,

ERNEST CALLENBACH, *Editor.*

[Telegram]

OCTOBER 11, 1974.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Washington, D.C.:

Please be advised that this museum heartily endorses the principle of providing congressional fundings for the American Film Institute in reference to H.R. 17021. We firmly believe that the AFI if properly funded can be of invaluable assistance to our efforts in bringing outstanding cinema programs to the Delaware Valley.

EVAN TURNER,
Philadelphia Museum of Art.

SINKING CREEK FILM CELEBRATION,
Greeneville, Tenn., October 11, 1974.

Congressman BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Education Subcommittee,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.:

Re: H.R. 17021

The Public Media Program of the National Endowment for the Arts has an outstanding record in support of all past, present and future aspects of the art of the motion picture.

Particularly, its broad nationwide encouragement of imaginative educational projects, film teachers in the schools, filmmaking artists, film historians and archivists has resulted in its being regarded as a truly concerned division of this most important Government Agency.

We urge that it continue functioning with no change in the responsibilities and powers which it administers so well and fairly for the benefit of all regions of the United States and all facets of film art.

MARY JANE COLEMAN,
Director, Sinking Creek Film Celebration.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
University Park, Pa., October 10, 1974.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I wish to offer my strongest possible support for HR. 17021.

I have just been informed of this opportunity for direct funding of the American Film Institute, and wish there were time to properly inform the academic community in general. I assure you the support would be very nearly unanimous.

The AFI has been doing a great job; solid work both artistically and culturally, wise support for both established and experimental efforts. They are well worthy of funding on this basis alone, but the cinema is a constantly increasing force in the international realm, and the prestige that will accrue to the USA from this program is worth many times the relatively trivial investment the program requires.

Please do all you can to insure their support.

Sincerely,

JOHN HAAG,
Associate Professor.

[Telegram]

SELECT EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

Regarding legislation H.R. 17021 urge further consideration and soliciting view points from educational film community before taking action.

CATHERINE M. EGAN,
State College, Pa., Audio Visual Specialist.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA,
October 10, 1974.

MR. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Not only as an artist filmmaker and educator, but more importantly as a thinking private citizen, I urge you to give Bill #17021 your fullest attention and support.

The American Film Institute has and is performing a most vital need and task in our society and cultural activities. Supporting the A.F.I. activities is as essential, or more so, a duty than tending to the material needs of an over-materialized society.

We, the American citizens, need the fiber, strength and heritage of this outstanding organization. Permanent dependable support of the A.F.I. is one of the ways we can demonstrate our positive view for a better society to come.

Most sincerely,

WILL HINDLE,
Associate Professor, Art Department.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., October 14, 1974.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS, I received your news release about your bill which would make the American Film Institute Independent. It was especially interesting to note that of the various people listed to testify most were or are board members of the AFI. I did not note anyone who was from the educational community who would testify.

All would agree that the AFI has done much good in many areas. Their preservation program has been excellent. However, in many cases the management of the AFI has been questionable. They have frequent "emergencies," change over in personnel and the like.

The Advanced Study Center in Beverly Hills takes the greater share of the AFI budget. It is supposed to function, as far as I know, as a halfway station in working in the profession. If one could get the actual figures on the cost of educating a fellow at the center, I think all would be astounded.

Here at USC we educate film students. Many go directly into the profession without the need for an Advanced Study Center. I would like to suggest that the entire budget for the Center be turned over to the film schools of our country to be used for postgraduate study as a way into the profession if such a way is needed. I am certain the cost would be considerably less than the cost of operating the Center in Beverly Hills.

I am suggesting that we can get much more for my tax dollar by letting the AFI do what it has done well and letting the film schools do what they can do when it is clearly superior to the AFI operation. In this I am fully supported by 17 other full time faculty of USC Cinema.

We would welcome an opportunity to testify before your committee. The AFI has no educational input. They terminated the University & College Education committee.

Very truly yours,

BERNARD R. KANTOR,
Chairman, Division of Cinema.

[Telegram]

REMSENBURG, N.Y.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS:

Strongly urge passage of H.R. 17021 supporting AFI, one of our outstanding cultural institutions.

ANNE BELLE,
Independent Filmmaker.

[Mailgram]

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: In regard to H.R. 17021 film teachers must ask you not to allow steamrolling by the American Film Institute. Please make all hearings in the future which relate to film grant money open to the public.

JOHN TETON,
Lecturer, Department of Film, San Francisco State University.

[Telegram]

CHEVY CHASE, MD.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS:

Urge passage H.R. 17021 as physician and educator find film institute most valuable.

DR. IRVING SCHNEIDER.

FILM WRIGHT
San Francisco, Calif., October 18, 1974.

Re: H.R. 17021—Funding of film projects and education.
Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
House Select Subcommittee of Education,
Rayburn House Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS:

First, I would like to request a copy of this Bill in order to further study its precise wording. Having been deeply involved for some twelve years in many aspects of independent film production, distribution, educational "hardware" and "software," as a consultant for one year to the American Film Institute, and now as an instructor in Film and Educational Technology at San Francisco State University, I am concerned about and effected by the government funding for projects in these areas.

I will grant that without the determination of George Stevens, Jr. there would likely not be an American Film Institute. I would also grant that they have accomplished some amount of beneficial works for the world of film. However, I believe that some serious cost-effectiveness analysis and management analysis in depth must be undertaken by an objective and knowledgeable element before all control of government funding of all film related projects is put under the AFI's roof. The recent dissension by the Fellows is only symtomatic of long existing problems in priorities and management throughout the AFI. In com-

[illegible] the funding projects administered by the Public Media section of the National Endowment for the Arts has benefited more people in more diverse ways with, I believe, far more effectiveness.

We are clearly at an evaluation point in education, the arts and media. We can waste no more money. I would be happy to detail further for you and the staff's committee my considered and eclectic perspective for the future. Specifically, I ask that some hearing be broadened to include more and different viewpoints from those already presented. I also respectfully suggest that the management of such public arts and education funding be redesigned for maximum effectiveness, particularly regarding the American Film Institute. Their future could be very bright. But, without thoughtful redesign, my faith must lie in the Endowment's track record.

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT J. WRIGHT, *President.*

Enclosure.

ADDENDUM TO LETTER

Prescott J. Wright:

Chairman of Advisory Board—Association for Media Educators.

Past Chairman—Central California Council of Teachers of English—Film Commission.

Past Chairman—Film Council—National Audio Visual Association.

Co-chairman—Film As Art Division—San Francisco International Film Festival (four years).

Judge—Foothill Independent Filmmakers Festival, Monterey Film Festival, Sonoma State College Film Festival.

Co-director—Third Annual Film-Media Institute, University of California, Berkeley; Education Extension.

Director—International Tournee of Animation and delegate to the Association Internationale du Film d'Animation, and Director of the San Francisco Animation Association.

Instructor in Film and Educational Technology, San Francisco State University.

Consultant in Motion Picture Distribution: American Film Institute, Berkeley Film Institute, BFA Educational Media, and independent producers.

[Telegram]

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS.

We strongly support the passage of H.R. 17021, pertaining to the American Film Institute.

GARY ESSERT,
Director, Los Angeles International Film Exposition.

[Mailgram]

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Concerning H.R. 17021:

Please hear more speakers on this issue. AFI does not evidence sufficient commitment to school and students to justify their management of all film project funds. Only professional educators and artists can insure that this money actually reaches our students.

MARSHA W. NORMAN,
Filmmaker in the Schools NEA 1971–1973, Currently Director, Special Arts Project, Louisville Board of Education and Kentucky Arts Commission.

THE JOURNAL OF POPULAR FILM
October 9, 1974.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS, *Chairman,*
House select subcommittee on Education
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADEMAS: We are writing to indicate our support of House legislation, HR 17021. We believe that the passage of this bill would gr[illegible] aid the cause of film study in this country.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL T. MARSDEN,
Co-editor.
JOHN G. NACHBAR,
Co-editor.

[Mailgram]

Re to H.R. 17021

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Capitol Hill
Washington, D.C.

I object to the blanket granting of all film production and education monies to American Films Institute. I have worked for them and in film education and none question management and planning. I ask for open hearings and full information.

PRESCOTT WRIGHT,
Chairman, Advisory Board Association.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn., October 15, 1974.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
United States Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I am writing to you about Bill No. H.R. 17021 which, as I understand it, is to provide a regular and annual federal subsidy to the American Film Institute under the directorship of George Stevens, Jr.

While there is no question that film, certainly our most important art, deserves a good deal more support from the federal government than it currently receives, I believe this proposal should be studied with a careful eye towards the past record of the AFI and whether these established policies will provide the most beneficial situation for the future.

I think you will find widespread disaffection towards the AFI, especially among the large and active body of American independent film-makers, a group which holds the greatest promise for the future of film art in our country.

Yours sincerely,

STANDISH D. LAWDER,
Associate Professor History of Art.

[Mailgram]

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Urge your strongest support for passage of H.R. 17021 and all support to American Film Institute.

LAWRENCE JACKSON,
University Cinema Associates, Inc.

[Mailgram]

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Hon. Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

I urge you to set aside House bill 17021 until the American Film Institute's administrative record can be investigated and until the film community has a chance to provide input to you.

AUSTIN LAMONT.

[Mailgram]

BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICH.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

I vidently oppose H.R. 17021.

JOHN GEOGHEGAN,
President, Detroit Area Film Teachers.

[Mailgram]

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

I support H.R. 17021. AFI deserves your support.

MARSHA KINDER,
Professor, Occidental College.

[Telegram]

BLOOMINGTON, IND.

The Select Education Subcommittee, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.:

As president of the Educational Film Library Association and of the Indiana Film Council I urge that no immediate action be taken on legislation in H.R. 17021 until adequate input from the educational film community can be solicited and presented for the select subcommittee's consideration.

STEPHEN C. JOHNSON,
Indiana University, Audio Visual Center.

BOWLING GREEN, OHIO, *October 9, 1974.*

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I write to you to very strongly support H.R. 17021, the bill to have the American Film Institute permanently supported by the Federal Government.

I have been an academic for 25 years working in those areas of American culture that include films and their many ramifications. I know the value of such materials in and out of academia.

Americans have a terrible habit of ignoring materials until they are destroyed and then of being willing to spend millions in vain efforts to recover them. Not to save our films would be a national tragedy—and dumb. The AFI should be regarded as valuable in its own way as the Smithsonian, the Library of Congress, and other such treasures.

I hope the bill to make the AFI a national treasure passes.

Sincerely,

RAY BROWNE.

[Mailgram]

PORTLAND, OREG.

Congressman JOHN B. BRADEMAS,
Capitol Hill, Washington, D.C.:

As a regional center interested in the expansion of the American Film Institutes capability to respond to the needs of similar institutions throughout the Nation, we would like to indicate our support for measure H.R. 17021 to allow AFI to apply directly for congressional funding.

DR. ROBERT M. SITTON,
Director, North West Film Study Center, Portland Art Museum, South West Park and Madison.

[Mailgram]

DAVENPORT, IOWA.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Please record our support of current bill to render American Film Institute eligible for Federal funding. As distributors of vintage motion pictures, we have enjoyed an insiders awareness of film archive practices in this country for many years and can affirm without hesitation that AFI contributions to preservation of our national film heritage has been unique. AFI has collected more significant American film than any other private archive in this country. Library of Congress would we believe be first to concede that more than 10 thousand of their most important films now preserved in public interest are direct results of AFI effort. We recognize other AFI activities have been controversial and frankly disagree with some policies of present AFI administration however in the long run these differences will be forgotten while everyone who cares about art or sociology of film will remain grateful that Congress recognized the cultural and historic importance of direct support of AFI in its principal mission of film and television preservation.

KENT EASTIN,
President, The Eastin-Phelan Corp., Blackhawk Films.

[Mailgram]

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
Washington, D.C.:

As a national association of 5,000 film and media teachers we urge that bill number H.R. 17021 receive further hearings, the American Film Institute has demonstrated little respect for or awareness of the complex issues involved in this area and should not in haste be granted funding control while new curriculum is being developed in our schools. Our children deserve better.

Respectfully,

RICHARD PLACE,
Executive Secretary, National Association of Media Educators.

JS COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
Huntington, N.Y., October 19, 1974.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, House Select Subcommittee on Education, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As an independent film producer, I am most interested in your recommending passage of H.R. 17021, concerning eligibility of the American Film Institute for federal funding.

Film is an art form that is uniquely American, born, nurtured and matured through the talents of those kids who experimented with new medium, creating

from it the most forceful communication's tool in Man's history. But film is still a young art form, challenging the film maker to take new directions, to seek new visions.

AFI, through its grants to young film makers, creates an atmosphere in which they can develop new approaches in film communications, unfettered [illegible] under consideration. The Institute offers an invaluable service to the artist, the public and the industry, serving as a platform from which all can learn about the medium's past, its growth, and its potential.

Passage of H.R. 17021 would give AFI the opportunity to expand its activities, strengthening it as a source for stimulation and guidance to talented American film makers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. SIBONGIN, *President.*

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATIONS AND THEATER,
Philadelphia, Pa., October 3, 1974.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
School subcommittee on Education,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I am disturbed in hearing about H.R. 17021, the bill to fund the American Film Institute for which so-called public hearings were held last week. Not only do I find this bill ill-conceived, but as an educator interested in the function and the future of the AFI I am bothered at the lack of public notice distributed that such hearings were being held.

The American Film Institute was established to provide an instrinsic link between the film industry and the educational community. To this date, their record has been extremely poor in fulfilling this promise. The problem, I think, is not simply in funding but in the administration and management of the Institute. While governmental funding may solve some of the AFI's problems, I do not as a taxpayer feel that the Institute should presently be funded from my tax dollars until I am assured that the make-up of the Institute will be responsive to its constituency. As an educator, I particularly feel that until the Institute can recognize the needs of the educational community, it is unworthy of governmental support.

I urge you to reschedule public hearings on this bill so that a substantial number of educators (and, indeed, the membership of AFI) will be able to present you and your committee with more views than those carrying the official sanction of the present AFI administration.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY J. LYONS,
Assistant Professor.

[Telegram]

NEW YORK, N.Y.

SELECT EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

From 1968 to 1971, I was affiliated with American Film Institute in the publishing of Filmfacts, a reference work on motion pictures. Although the AFI wish to assume control of the publication and retain me as supervising editor, I terminated the relationship because of AFI's failure to meet the needs of the Film community, their lack of judicious administrative guidance, and, on a more personal level, their attempt to sell without my knowledge or authorization, previous Filmfact material to a commercial publisher. I not only strongly urge that bill H.R. 17021 be rejected, but would be willing to offer testimony on my personal knowledge of AFI's waste of Government fundings.

ERNEST FARMENTIER.

[Mailgram]

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., November 25, 1974.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Washington, D.C.:

During discussion and voting regarding the American Film Institute, such as H.R. 17021, please read into the record of the appropriate subcommittees the following statement regarding the proposed H.R. 17021. We the undersigned feel that it would be a mistake at this time and without further investigation and public discussion for Congress to appropriate public funds directly for the American Film Institute. In its 7 years of existence the American Film Institute has shown a lack of responsiveness to the needs of film educators at all levels, independent film and video artists, librarians, archivists, critics, independent film exhibitors, school and college film programmers and film societies, and the audiences which they serve. The AFI has evidenced distinct problems in management regarding personnel and finances. The alarming turnover in key personnel would seem to be a strong indicator of mismanagement and failure to set and support the priorities that a national film institute is supposed to have. It would be a mistake to vest public funds in an institution until that institution has demonstrated an ability and a willingness to work hand in hand with that larger film community and to be responsive to its needs. Until that day is here, the proper stewardship of public funds requires that money for the American Film Institute continue to be channeled through the National Endowment for the Arts and other government agencies which have shown over and over again that they can act imaginatively and responsibly. It seems to us that the very concept of a national endowment was that it could and would assemble a staff and expert panels representative of the areas in question and capable of making wise decisions about arts funding. Until the day that the American Film Institute can demonstrate that it can make more prudent and creative use of public money we think that the proposed bill would be a disservice to the film community.

Ernest Farmentier, editor, Film Facts; Lawrence Loewinger, Steven Gyllenhaal, and Ed Lynch, director, Association of Independent Video and Film Artists; William Starrs, executive secretary, American Federation of Film Societies; Donald Staples, president, University Film editor, Film Library Quarterly; John Hanhardt, curator of film Whitney Museum of American Art; John Culkin, director, Center for Understanding Media; Terry Kemper Whitney; Museum of American Art; Barbara Bryant, director, Phoenix Films; Austin Belmont, board of directors, Film Society of Lincoln Center; Karen Cooper, director, Film Forum; Amos Vogel, director, Annenberg Cinematheque, University of Pennsylvania; Brian Penlifer, director, Media Educators Association; Stefan Sharf, professor and chairman, Film Division, Columbia University; Nadine Covert, director, Educational Film Library Association; Ted Perry, professor and chairman, department of cinema studies, New York University.

RICHARD KAPLAN,
Film Consultant.